

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1906.

---

I.

DR. RAUCH AS MAN AND PHILOSOPHER.\*

BY R. C. SCHIEDT, PH.D.

Centennial celebrations are no longer a rarity among us; they indicate not only our growth in years but also, and especially, our increase in grateful appreciation of the work of the early pioneers on whose sturdy shoulders we stand. Such occasions are, furthermore, not confined to the land of "May Flower" fame. Not only the classic soil of New England has its "Sleepy Hollows" where the sons and daughters of the Republic gather for memorial service; even in localities of much less pretentious claims we now point with melancholy pride to many a sacred spot where some of the nation's mighty sons were lovingly laid to rest. Lancaster, old historic Lancaster, has more than one such "Sleepy Hollow," unknown to, and unnoticed by the average passerby who only lives in the present and for the future. It is with more than mere sentimental interest that I take you to-night, in spirit at least, to the small college plot in the Lancaster Cemetery, to the unpretentious marble column, which surmounts the resting place of the mortal remains of one of the infant Republic's most

\* Oration delivered at the centennial celebration of Rauch's birthday.

brilliant minds, the founder and first president of Marshall College, *the Rev. Dr. Frederick Augustus Rauch*. Although never an actual citizen of Lancaster, his relation to Franklin and Marshall College has made him an ever-living force in the intellectual and spiritual life of our community, and the centennial of his birth, which we celebrate to-night, is therefore not only a College affair but an occasion of historic importance for the whole town.

His life and work were a gift of those Hessian lands of Germany whose rulers had committed the most atrocious crimes directly against their own subjects by coercing them into English military service and indirectly against the American colonies, against whom England hurled the Hessians during the war of the Revolution. This magnificent gift fully atoned for the sins ignorantly committed by England's German soldiers.

His birth which occurred on the twenty-seventh of July, 1806, in Kirchbracht, Hesse, fell in the tumultuous times of Germany's deepest humiliation. As the son of a Reformed pastor in one of the least prosperous regions of the Fatherland he very early became acquainted with the hardships of poverty and the heroism of self-sacrifice. The year of his birth witnessed the disastrous battle of Jena, when Napoleon's soldiers swept over Europe with irresistible force, creating consternation everywhere and paralyzing all trade and traffic throughout the continent. Rauch's childhood covered those distressing years during which the German states seemed to have lost their identity, and national consciousness had received its death-blow. But the young boy also witnessed the great national resurrection, the creation of a new citizenship, the abolishment of serfdom, of many caste privileges and prerogatives. He had felt the thrill of enthusiasm that passed over his country with cyclonic force, when the youths of town and village banded together to annihilate the common arch enemy and to rehabilitate the fair name of the fatherland. Those

were the days that paralleled the great revolutionary epoch of the American colonies which ended in the establishment of a new Republic. Fichte's address to the German nation had fired the young men and women with a new and more fervent patriotism. Arndt's poetic appeal to his people to return to the faith of the fathers had aroused an intense religious ardor that filled the most earnest with a holy wrath for all that was low and mean, and stirred in them the noblest ideals and highest resolves for heroic sacrifice, for God, for home and for country. If environment counts for anything, surely here were conditions most favorable for the growth of the finest type of manhood. Young Rauch was but nine years old—it was the year of the Corsican's final catastrophe at Waterloo—when he started on his own responsibility upon his college course at the gymnasium of Hanau. It is a curious coincident that Germany's deepest political humiliation occurred during the golden age of her poetry, philosophy and philology. They made the chief impress upon her schools and universities. Just as in modern times the curriculum of our colleges and universities preponderates on the side of the natural sciences, and the majority of our young men specialize along the line of technical pursuits, so were at the beginning of the nineteenth century the classic languages, especially Greek, the chief means of a liberal culture. In Germany Lessing, Goethe and Schiller had aroused unbounded enthusiasm for Greek art and learning, the dry bones of the old formalistic philological instruction had been revived by the inbreathing of a new soul, and the new philology had become the science par excellence. The keenest thinkers of the age worshipped at her shrine. Young Rauch was attracted to it from the very start. He had caught the spirit of the master mind Wilhelm von Humboldt, the profoundly critical mediator between the linguistic and the poetic arts, the founder of the modern German gymnasium and of the University of Berlin. We can hardly appreciate to-day what Homer and Æschylos, what Greece

was to those men—the highest ideal of æsthetic culture realized in a perfect and beautiful humanity. It meant something for the training of a brilliant mind, such as young Rauch's, to be brought under the influence of the nascent enthusiasm for new national ideals in learning and for Pestalozzi's ideas in method. Hardly eighteen years old, he passed the very difficult entrance examination into the university with marked distinction. His early publications indicated how thoroughly he had entered into the spirit of his masters. From the pen of the youth came "A Latin Treatise on the Electra of Sophocles"; "The Identity of the Hindoos, Persians, Germans and Slavs, as Indicated by their Language, Religion and Manners"; "A Critique of Goethe's Faust," pronounced by Goethe himself in his "Conversations with Eckermann" as "one of the best"; "A Book on the Literature of the Indians and Persians"; etc. It meant a great deal more for the young college to be started in the new world to have an exponent of the ripest and finest thought of the old world for its founder. How thoroughly he revolutionized the old methods of teaching the classics in the United States is most graphically described by Dr. Theodore Appel, the only one of his pupils still with us, in his "College Recollections."

But those early years in the gymnasium were not only spent by Rauch in philological mining operations. Something else had entered the classic centers of learning since thousands of young students had shed their blood for a rejuvenated fatherland, and thousands had returned with higher ideals and maturer purposes—it was the conviction that a true educational institution must be deeply rooted in the regenerative power of the highest moral ideals. On the field of battle they had learned that great leaders are absolutely essential and that all true education begins in obedience. There they had suddenly begun to understand Tacitus and to comprehend the "categorical imperative" of Kant—a free and united Germany became the watchword of all youthful enthusiasm

and the right of public opinion a new factor in national life. Fichte had started the new movement through his addresses. Heinrich von Kleist embodied it in his characters on the stage and Schleiermacher preached it from the pulpit. The universities of Jena and Giessen had become the centers of the new agitation, the others rallied around them. When Rauch entered the University of Marburg in 1824 his mind was matured far beyond that of the ordinary youth of eighteen, his soul was stirred to its depths by the serious problems of the times. At Marburg, Giessen and Heidelberg he devoted himself with great zeal to the study of theology and philology, including philosophy, so that, at the age of twenty-one, in 1827 he took his doctor's degree "summa cum laude" at Marburg, became a "privat docent" or lecturer at Giessen in 1828 and professor extraordinary in the same university in 1830. In 1831 he was called to Heidelberg as professor ordinarius in philosophy, receiving the highest professional honor bestowed by German universities at the early age of twenty-five, thus completing a record which has only once been repeated by the erratic genius, Friedrich Nietzsche. Before, however, Rauch could enter upon his work in Heidelberg he became involved in the great political upheaval of the times. The popular movement for a united Germany was threatened with failure, because it lacked proper leadership, and the princes seemed to have forgotten the promises made to the people; the government became suspicious of any and every enthusiastic demonstration of a political or semi-political nature and began to persecute particularly the members of the patriotic student associations called the "Burschenschaften" because they still dared to dream of a united fatherland. The University of Giessen was particularly in disfavor on account of the predominance of the Burschenschaft element, and a man had been appointed as its chancellor who was known as the all-powerful arch reactionary, Baron Franz Joseph von Ahrens. He had sent pastor Weidig and other young noble

patriots to prison because they still advocated what were looked upon as treasonable issues. Dr. Rauch publicly declared himself in behalf of the imprisoned men, true to the ideals of his youth, and was at once threatened with arrest. The situation had grown very serious, for imprisonment for political treason then meant life imprisonment or even death. On the advice of his friends and his father he fled to America. Like Karl Schurz of later years, Rauch sacrificed for the sake of his convictions a noble career, a brilliant future, the happiness of his nearest and dearest relatives and friends. Such is the stuff of which heroes are made, to whom personal considerations are a very secondary matter, when great principles of righteousness are at stake. This very incident gives us the key to Rauch's character as a man. It explains the high tone of his teachings and philosophical system. It was undoubtedly a great calamity from one point of view but also a magnificent exhibition of the highest capabilities of true manhood which could not help but carry with it great blessings. It was a calamity to take ruthlessly a man out of an environment of which he had become such an integral part, that they seemed mutually indispensable; he seemed to be in direct line of succession to that galaxy of men, among whom Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher were the great luminaries. Philosophy and theology had apparently lost one of their champions by right, Germany one of her most promising sons. While a student in Heidelberg Rauch had come under the special influence of the distinguished philosopher and theologian Charles Daub, the author of a work called "Modern Dogmatic Theology" from Schelling's standpoint. He was one of the few theologians at that time advocating a more positive religious faith and life. With him young Rauch was to work, shoulder to shoulder, on the religious structure of the new Germany, for his theological publications issued during his sojourn at Giessen had given high promise as to his positive stand and profound grasp of the new christocentric principles

superseding the long rule of rationalism and pantheism. But all these hopes were now shattered, when he turned his face to the New World. Before him lay the great ocean and an unknown land, where he had neither friend nor name. In the fall of 1831 Rauch arrived in America. Accidentally he drifted to Easton, Pa., earning a livelihood by giving lessons on the piano, of which he was a master. In a marvellously short time, however, he mastered the new and strange environment, its language and its customs. The brilliancy of his attainments did not remain hidden very long. In quick succession he became professor of the German language and literature at Lafayette College and in 1832 head master of a classical school in York, Pa., which was, in connection with the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, under the care of Dr. Mayer. His youthful vigor and enthusiasm brought new life to the whole institution. After having been ordained to the office of the holy ministry in the same year he not only taught most of the branches in the preparatory school, but was at the same time professor of Biblical literature in the Theological Seminary. In the year 1833 he married a daughter of Mr. Loammi Moore, of Morristown, N. J., which step gave the assurance that he would become a permanent citizen of the United States. With restless energy he threw himself into the current of his new life. Chiefly through his instrumentality the Classical High School was removed from York to Mercersburg and there elevated into Marshall College in 1836. Dr. Rauch became thus the virtual founder of old Marshall College. Though poor in endowments and insignificant in the number of its students and members of its faculty the young president, like Mark Hopkins at Williams College, made it a dominant force in the educational and intellectual life of the nation. Here originated under Rauch's leadership and initiative what in the course of years came to be known as *Mercersburg philosophy and theology*.

To appreciate fully what that meant we have to know something of the educational policy prevalent in this country during the first four decades of the nineteenth century. When Marshall College opened with 14 students in 1836 Harvard College had just celebrated its 200th anniversary, the number of students enrolled was 233, and the faculty consisted of hardly a dozen instructors. In Yale and Princeton the numbers were still less and the income from their endowments amounted only to a few thousand dollars. In 1825 Union College of New York had passed Harvard and Yale in the number of its students and for a quarter of a century it held the honor of being the largest college in the United States. This was due to the influence of its great president Dr. Nott, who for sixty-two years stood at the head of that institution and attracted students from all parts of the country. Union College was also the first one which modified the classical course and inaugurated the so-called optional system allowing the substitution of modern languages and an increased amount of mathematical and physical sciences in place of Greek and Latin. But what was needed especially in those days was not so much expansion as impact, not so much enumeration of branches as enumeration of pedagogic principles. The psychology and political philosophy of John Locke had become quite naturally the ruling factors in our educational system, they breathed the spirit of the English revolution of 1688; they fostered the secular ideas of the great French revolution and Franklin and Jefferson had planned systems of education quite after the French pattern. What they lacked was a unifying principle. John Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding" was the chief metaphysical text-book in all the American colleges of that time. It was to furnish the survey and guide in all matters moral and intellectual. The two main characteristics of his system are: (1) his craving to know and to speak the truth and the whole truth in everything, truth not for a purpose but for itself; (2) his perfect

trust in the reason as the guide, the only guide, to truth. As a matter of common experience, however, we know that human reason is liable to incalculable variations and likely enough to shipwreck those who steer by it alone. He, therefore, on the one hand exaggerates the importance of one function of the mind and unduly diminishes the importance of the rest. In his scheme of education little thought is taken for the play of the affections and feelings and as for the imagination, it is treated merely as a source of mischief. Moreover, if true knowledge which Locke calls "the internal perception of the mind" can only be acquired by the exercise of reason then childhood must be excluded from the pursuit of knowledge and the only thing to be taught is the formation of habit. Locke was clearly an empiricist and the results of his system were only too apparent in the social and political status of the young Republic. Rauch, trained in the schools of Kant and Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, naturally found himself at variance with the fundamental teachings of the American college. However, he was open-minded enough to appreciate the strong points of the empirical system and went at once vigorously to work to write out his own system of thought best adapted to existing conditions. Although not yet thirty years of age, the number of his publications and their influence had become quite considerable, so that writing was to him a most agreeable occupation, and his articles in the leading journals of the day were widely read. He became the first important bridge-builder between the German and American thought-worlds. Dr. Nevin says of him in his "Eulogy": "He found himself impelled to attempt the work of transferring, to some extent at least, into the literature of this country . . . the life and power of German thinking generally, under its more recent forms in all that relates to the phenomenology of the soul. For this task he was eminently qualified—beyond all other scholars probably belonging to our land. He was at home in the philosophy of Great Britain as well as in that of Germany

and knew accurately the points of contact and divergency by which the relations of the two systems of thought to one another, generally considered, are characterized. . . . Not only was Dr. Rauch familiar with American life and thought, but he had come to identify himself completely with us as a people."

His first great book, and unfortunately the only complete one published by him in the country of his adoption, appeared in 1840 under the title "Psychology; or a View of the Human Soul; including Anthropology," New York, M. A. Dodd, publisher. It was the first work published on psychology in this country and made at once a profound impression, heralded by A. O. Brownson, its chief reviewer, as "a book of genius." The first edition was exhausted in six weeks, finding at once entrance into the best colleges as a text-book, and continuing to be used as such for well-nigh forty years. Reading it to-day in the light of modern discoveries and evolutionary methods one is struck by its lucid style, usually not found in such books, the wealth of illustrations and the great familiarity of the author with so many facts in natural history. Though Herbert Spencer might question the distinction which Rauch makes in his elaborate Introduction between sensation, perception and apperception as belonging to the vegetable, animal and human types respectively, or severely ridicule his division of mental philosophy into anthropology and psychology proper, since he denies the self-existence of mind, it is a question with me whether after all men like James, Baldwin and Münsterberg or even Wundt do not agree with the essentials of Rauch's system. One thing was sure at the outset, viz., that the new psychology of the president of young Marshall College completely superseded in educational value Locke's empiricism as set forth in his "Essay on the Human Understanding." According to the latter *reason* is the *only* organ of knowing and as such it is imperfect and limited. Knowledge must, therefore, be likewise imperfect and limited. According to

the former the organ of knowing is the whole man; with Schelling he believes in the oneness of life, guided by the spirit, as manifested by its gradual unfolding through a *succession* of faculties; "near the root are the senses; these are followed by attention and conception; higher than these are fancy, imagination and memory, which may be considered as the blossoms on the tree of knowledge; while pure thinking under the form of understanding, judgment, reason and will are the ripe fruits." This is what Dr. Nevin calls the author's "Psychological Tree" by which he is governed in treating afterwards of the life of the mind in detail. He discusses the faculties of the soul under the two heads of Reason and Will, each consisting of higher and lower forms of activity, closely interwoven, and manifesting themselves as one and indissoluble. In order to know we must constantly will to know, and this will is according to Rauch either *natural* (or psychic), and as such determined by the feelings, passions or appetites of the soul, or *moral*, and as such spiritual and free with power to rule over man's lower nature. Such "liberty is a free activity, one that is not arbitrariness, but includes necessity." Psychology treated from this standpoint was something refreshingly new in this country, quite different from John Locke's empiricism, which taught that the first and only impulse to all psychic activities is derived from the functions of sensibility, thus making the will purely natural and exposing the training of character to the pitfalls of a melancholy determinism. What a tremendous effect it had upon educational methods became soon apparent. With Herbart, the great pedagogue and Rauch's cotemporary, psychology was merely the mechanics of mental processes, instruction nothing but the organized ladling out of concepts and ideas to the pupil, education nothing more than instruction. With Rauch instruction meant the awakening of intellectual self-activity, the bringing out of the individual's characteristics and education the training of will and heart. And this is in theory at least

precisely what modern pedagogics proclaim as the latest psychology, the experimental physiological psychology of Spencer, Wundt and others. If Rauch had taught at Harvard his name would at once have been proclaimed from the housetops of our educational workshops throughout the length and breadth of the land. "Had he lived," says Dr. Nevin, "a few years longer, he would have lifted even the village of Mercersburg into the view of the whole land." As it was, Mercersburg philosophy on the theoretical side found its way gradually but surely into the systems of the day, notably into that of Dr. McCosh, of Princeton; on the practical side it became the standard of judgment of the best men who went forth from the halls of Marshall College and later from those of Franklin and Marshall, so that it could be said that the alumni of those institutions could be recognized by the method of reasoning which governed their public and printed utterances. To-day the words of Dr. Rauch, uttered seventy years ago in his inaugural address, have become the common good of all the great educators of the land: "The fortune of our lives and our government depends not exclusively on useful knowledge but on our character as citizens, and to form this character by cultivating the whole man is the aim of education in the proper sense."

But the publication of his *Psychology* was only the beginning of a trilogy of works, the second one of which was to be on "Christian Ethics" and the third on "Æsthetics." They were finished in full outline, when his untimely end came in 1841. The same lofty idealism dominant in his first volume is fundamental in his subsequent works. In his *æsthetics* he superseded Schlegel in his ethics and Kant and Fichte. Schlegel, the romanticist par excellence, had lost himself in the sentimental mysticism of the Middle Ages, when the outward in art attracted supreme attention, leading to a prostitution of heathen art in the production of statues and paintings of the saints. Rauch emphasized the necessity of a sci-

ence of art, a philosophy of the beautiful to keep it within the proper sphere of truth which does not pay religious homage to outward forms; all that which was incongruous, bizarre and undisciplined, therefore, in Romantic æstheticism was unmercifully condemned in the new æsthetics. In the sphere of ethics Rauch encountered Kant's "categorical imperative" and Fichte's supreme "Ego," both of whom identified freedom of the will with self-determination. He defined the freedom of the human will as harmony with the divine will, which is more than a formal mechanical obedience to the "thou shalt" of the decalogue, inasmuch as it rises above the motive of fear of punishment and leads to a truly moral life which is governed by the dictates of love. Rauch's Ethics, therefore, became preëminently Christian Ethics, however not from a theological but from a Christian point of view. It was the only respectable system of thought which gave positive hopes and practical ideals to an age of general confusion.

What a pity that such works had to remain unfinished torsos. But unceasing labor had overtaxed the delicate bodily frame of the author. Though firm and robust in his convictions, he was as gentle as a child in his manner, and as gentle as his walk among men had been so was also his passing away. In the early hours of the second of March, 1861, his noble soul took its flight to its eternal home.

Every nation needs at the outset above all else great thinkers, who mark out the course of its history, but to pay full tribute to such men is a difficult matter. The splendid discoveries in the realm of nature can be more definitely and accurately formulated than the achievements of a purely philosophical mind. For the very thoughts through which philosophers establish their own worth for human society manifest themselves, after being divested of their scholastic terminology, as indeed beautiful but well-known ideas which touch our hearts and mould our lives the more effectively the more they are blood of our blood and mind of our mind. Their chief

value lies in their power to stir our deepest emotions and to touch our personality on all the shores of its being.

For with Rauch the contents of pure thinking are not mere abstractions, but realities the very soul and life of individual things, and as such exist not merely in our thoughts but equally as much in nature. In this he stands out preëminently distinct from the prevailing college thought of America as well as from the ruling Hegelianism of Germany. With him "nature is a system, not a conglomeration, alive and active in all its elements and atoms; it is filled with powers, from the mechanical, chemical, magnetic and galvanic up to the organic, all of which flow invisibly into each other, affect and determine each other. Eternal laws dwell in them, and provided that, while these powers receive and work with and through each other, none interferes with the other or in any degree changes its nature, but supports and upholds it. Thus we have a constant life; powers flow up and down, to and fro." All this demonstrates a mental interaction between the bodily and the mental life; life as such is distinguished from the non-living by organization which does not proceed from matter but is the result of thought, "a thought of God accompanied by the divine will, to be realized in nature, and to appear externally in an organized body." Rauch thus superseded also Hegel with whom nature was merely an incident. He possessed not only a thorough empirical knowledge of the great discoveries which at his time had ushered in the new era of scientific research, but also a keen insight into the laws which enabled him to subject the empirical to philosophical deductions. It is certainly significant that the first president of Marshall College should in this wise have anticipated the mode of thought which characterizes the most positive philosophical teachings of modern times, notably those of Paulsen and James.

Says St. Bernard: "There are those who desire to know for the sole purpose of knowing, and it is idle curiosity; there are

those who desire to know in order to be known, and it is base ambition; there are those who desire to know in order to accumulate honors and wealth, and it is base avarice, and there are those who desire to know in order to be edified, and it is prudence, but there are those who desire to know that they may edify others, and it is charity." Rauch's life was one great desire to edify others. His lofty idealism, his profound sense of justice and righteousness, his gentleness of manner and his childlike faith in the eternal verities of our holy religion have wrought most powerfully in the lives of the sons of old Marshall College and have left us a heritage which by right of intrinsic value places Franklin and Marshall College in the forefront of the pioneer forces of the American commonwealth and confers upon the church and the community in which it lives and moves and has its being their most permanent values.

LANCASTER, PA.

## II.

### THE LANGUAGE QUESTION AS IT CONFRONTED OLD MARSHALL.\*

BY LINN HARBAUGH, ESQ.

In the midst of the rush and activities of this present life, it is fortunate indeed that one may now and then retreat to these quiet college halls. It were better still could we come bearing with us something thoughtful and original with which to greet our erstwhile student friends, and through which we might hope to do honor to the intellectual spirit and life which have pervaded these institutions for more than three score and ten years.

It is discouraging, therefore, at this moment to find oneself drifting back to an old idea that has been so learnedly dwelt upon time and again in this presence. I refer to that theory of historical study which has for its basis the language and literature of a people; the *lingua-centric* idea, as the man with the rough coining machine might define it.

This phase of history has been so well interpreted in past generations, and in broader fields than ours, that one is liable to be brought up upon the charge, in company with the poet's katydid, that:

"Thou say'st an undisputed thing  
In such a solemn way."

To consider, then, the various epochs of our institutional life from this standpoint, by simply compiling the great store of outward facts or data already gathered by competent historians, would be a labor wholly uncalled for and of little credit to any one attempting it. But to treat briefly of one

\* The Alumni Oration delivered in the Chapel of Franklin and Marshall College on Wednesday evening, June 13, 1906.

phase of our literary and theological growth, with some regard to the sequence and philosophy of history, is the more difficult task which the present speaker has set for himself; and this, too, without much confidence of a successful outcome, "since," to use the words of the great Chancellor Blackstone, "he freely confesses that his former more private attempts have fallen very short of his own ideas of perfection."

There is one saying, or seed thought, it may be called, which found original utterance in our own school of theology; and, in a peculiar sense, I lay claim to the right of its possession for the purposes of this hour: "As the eye that sees cannot see itself, so any great movement, in any given age, can never directly and fully understand itself, or measure the meaning of the activities and tendencies which strive and struggle in its own bosom."

In view of the rich heritage which has come down to us through the earnest lives of former generations, it is our plain duty to be looking backward, lest we forget. They blazed the way, though at times they could not see very far ahead. They did not always fully measure the meaning of the activities and tendencies of their own age, but they sought for and found the light and the truth with persistence and power unsurpassed in the present age.

Our forefathers of the German Reformed communion in this country were ministered unto by men of learning. While it is true that for many years the pioneer Germans were deprived of spiritual instruction and consolation because of the scarcity of regularly ordained pastors, they nevertheless cherished their pious faith as a blessed heritage from the fatherland, and have handed it down from generation to generation of their people; and this too, in face of the fact that men were at hand in that day, as they are in this, with motives purely mercenary, who played upon the religious credulity of these people, "and practised gross deceptions in the name of the church."

In view of the high standard of education maintained by the early missionaries to this country, it is not surprising to find Germans in America looking forward anxiously to the time when they might have their own school of the prophets.

Our church, at the time Marshall College was established, was torn by dissensions and diversity of opinion upon almost every question that could be raised; and the new school in its humble beginnings had many sore trials. But, as we all know, there were stout hearts and willing hands to work for its success, and the movement was not without encouragement from abroad.

The terms "college" and "seminary" for the present purpose, are somewhat interchangeable. The courses of study were sometimes interwoven by students whose time and means were limited. With little endowment for college or seminary, and with the question of language still unsolved, or in the unconscious process of solution, it could not be expected that the faculty of either department of learning would be maintained with its full complement of instructors.

Some of the questions which arose in the formative period of our Reformed Church in the United States were purely academic, and concerned and challenged the intellectual giants of the day. Other problems, such as the observance of the festivals of the church year, catechetical instruction and liturgical service, aroused the laity as well as the clergy.

But there was one question which went to the very heart and life of the people themselves—the question of language—and in this, it seems to me, the hand of God is discernable in a way as mysterious as it is positive and sure.

To avoid burdening the hour with facts that are familiar to all of us, I shall adopt a paragraph from "The Life of Philip Schaff":

"The proper and final relation of the German element to American institutions and modes of thought has been for a century one of the most difficult and troublesome questions

the Lutheran and German Reformed churches have had to deal with. They have had the double problem to settle—to satisfy the first and second generations of their adherents who used the German tongue exclusively or chiefly, and to retain their hold on the succeeding generations in whom the American element has come to be predominant. A constant struggle has been going on in families of German antecedents. The parents seek to perpetuate the use of the German language and customs among their children. The children feel a strong impulse to break away, and, if the use of the German is persisted in at public worship, wander off into the Anglo-American churches.”

But the question of course involved more than the religious and home life of the people themselves.

How were the riches of German literature and philosophy to be preserved to a people who had abandoned their own language?

How, on the other hand, were the German thought, life and language to be maintained in their purity and power by a people who had made as the home of their adoption a country destined to become a nation of one spirit and one speech?

This may perhaps suggest to you a theme, as it has already in my mind provoked the question:

Whence the guiding hand, or what were the inner impulses that moved a foreign German teacher and theologian, with one assistant and a few German-American students to make a peaceful invasion of a Scotch-Irish settlement in the Cumberland Valley seventy years ago?

As we look back upon it, the movement was fraught with the greatest importance. Viewed from a human standpoint it was made under the direction and guidance of able and pious men.

And yet, no man then living grasped the true significance of that event, and it was as astounding and unaccountable as was the election three years later of a Scotchman as the theo-

logical and literary head and guide of a church whose synod only fourteen years before had rebuked a young minister for attempting to make an address in the English language!

Let us review briefly some of the conditions which existed, and the movements of men, in the early years of Marshall College. Let us observe how much at cross-purposes these movements and conditions were, and yet how they came together, how they conspired to work out a great problem.

The little mountain village of Mercersburg was, like other settlements of the Cumberland Valley, of purely Scotch-Irish origin. For many years prior to the establishment of Marshall College this settlement had been the theater of great commercial activity. It was the scene of quiet social life and religious devotion. With the dawn of the nineteenth century families began to appear who are still largely represented by their descendants in the community. The town itself had taken on the appearance of a dignified and substantial place of abode. The streets were improved; brick dwellings, some of them rather imposing in design, appeared to take the places of the log houses of pre-revolutionary times. Men had been coming to the front with character and influence which soon extended to the state legislative halls, to the executive mansion, to the national Congress and to the White House. They were one and all Scotch-Irishmen, as that term has come to be understood in these days.

Such indeed was the character of this Conococheague settlement in temper and nationality for one hundred years until the German students' invasion of 1835.

"The two teachers who came on with the students," says Dr. Theodore Appel, "were Dr. Rauch and his faithful Achates, Professor Budd. They were both scholarly-looking men—young as yet, but with lines of thought and study already on their faces—both looking out upon the world through gold-rimmed spectacles."

In the old stone school house at the rear of the Presbyterian

Church, a temporary hall of learning was found. But the building committee was already at work providing better accommodations, and on August 17, 1836, the cornerstone of the large building on the hill was laid.

Thus it was that two teachers with eighteen young men, followed a little later by others, peacefully invaded the mountain village with their high-school belongings to found a college. Here began the influence of German life and thought in a Scotch-Irish settlement. Here began the unfolding of a divine purpose—a movement, considered from human limitations, that did not understand itself directly and fully—a movement which was destined to aid vastly in reconciling German-American life and education with true American citizenship.

What was the attitude of the workers?

Dr. Rauch was a master mind in German learning. But up until his lamented death he had great difficulty with the English language, and was extremely sensitive on the subject. "His thoughts," it is said, "were like so many caged birds, which he wished to let out, but the crowd was too great to get out in good order."

In the brief time allotted him, like many Germans of university education, he aimed to produce a system of philosophy. The result of his studies appears in a number of works on abstruse subjects—notably his "Psychology" and "Christian Ethics," which attracted the attention of eminent scholars in Europe and America. His lectures, as we know, are the basis of much of the learning now in use.

Although a representative of the people who were at that very time guarding their German language most jealously, Dr. Rauch exclaimed only a short time before his death: "Now, with Dr. Nevin by my side, I can breathe freely for the first time in America!"

Dr. Nevin himself, in a preliminary interview on the subject of accepting the professorship, gave as a reason for hesi-

tating, that, "Not being a native of the German church, he was afraid he would not be able to secure its confidence to such an extent as would be necessary to secure his personal comfort and success in the position in which it was proposed to place him." In accepting the call he said: "The call has been strange and unexpected; not only without my seeking, but *against* my own judgment and wish explicitly expressed and understood."

And further he observes: "My own training might appear to be providentially ordered by Him who leadeth the *blind in a way not understood* by themselves, with special reference to this very destination."

With reference to the synod which convened at Chambersburg, Pa., on January 29, 1840, and elected Dr. Nevin as professor of systematic theology, our distinguished historian, Dr. Dubbs, makes this pertinent observation:

"All the members of that synod have long since passed away, but in former years the present writer was well acquainted with many of them; and no one could furnish an adequate explanation of the reasons which influenced the mind of the synod in extending that remarkable call. . . . it was known that he (Nevin) had devoted some attention to the study of German theology, and this fact was greatly in his favor." The historian recites some additional facts, but concludes, "All this, however, does not adequately account for the fact that he was unanimously chosen."

How little does it all seem to accord with the action of synod only three years later in extending a call to the great preacher and theologian of Prussia, Dr. Frederick W. Krummacher?

Had Dr. Krummacher come, and indeed he seriously considered the call, he would have summoned all his great spirit and intellect and voice into one grand effort to preserve the language and to restore the German national life in America.

The selection of Philip Schaff, a young and enthusiastic

missionary, instead of Dr. Krummacher, seemed to be providential indeed at this critical time.

Hearken unto the voice of the great preacher, Krummacher, as he delivered the charge to Dr. Schaff at Elberfeld:

"You are to go forth," he said, "as the bearer of a pure German national spirit, to assist in restoring to new life a German population whose national character is already half destroyed by the admixture of foreign elements, to rescue it to the consciousness of its original dignity and proper independent existence. You are called to transport German theology in its thoroughness and depth and its strong free life together with the various branches of learning that stand related to it as a family of full-grown daughters."

Ten years later, when Dr. Schaff was in Berlin, Dr. Krummacher had not yet caught the true trend of German-American life, for he remarked laughingly to Dr. Schaff, that America had a big stomach and would certainly swallow him up and still have capacity left.

Dr. Schaff, when he turned in the direction of Mercersburg, did not give himself up to the thought of a life-long separation from Germany. In a lonely hour he wrote to one of his intimate friends: "What folly to put the institutions of the church away from the center of population to an inaccessible outpost! What will be thought of such a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy in 1900?" But afterwards, in unmistakable sincerity, he confessed that he owed his early American surroundings a debt of gratitude, and "but for the comparative seclusion of the earlier years of his American career, he would not have been able to do the work of later life." This was many years after he had exclaimed, in a moment of discouragement: "Oh, the abominable necessity of learning the English language!"

Let us see, if we can, in a brief way, how this German students' invasion of a Scotch-Irish community was involved in the question now before us.

First, with reference to the social, political and home life in which these two peoples shared.

Second, with regard to the transfusion of the German and English modes of thought in theology and literature, as it received its impetus at Marshall College.

Few of us indeed are ready to blame the Germans for clinging to the language of the fatherland. For the great majority of them it was the one thing, besides their religion, that they could bring with them to the new world; and it is safe to say that they never contemplated, in the departure from the land of their birth, the merging of their lives and customs in a nation with a common language not their own.\*

It is equally clear that the Scotch-Irish of the Cumberland Valley, who had maintained their language along with their homes, their own system of education and religion, and their commercial life, could not for a moment entertain the thought of adopting the German, or any other new language, as their own.

The social, civic and home life was all important, and was not ignored by Dr. Rauch. He remained president of Marshall College, as well as the guiding spirit of the theological seminary until his early death in 1841. The people of Mercersburg appreciated his presence amongst them. They quickly saw in his gentle bearing and refined nature, a man who could enlist the sympathies and affections of a nationality not of his own people. His love of music and intimate knowledge of the German composers, gave them a new insight into the beauties of the profound and inspiring anthems of the German masters.

They of the practical life were pleased not only with his learning and piety, but also with his ability to grasp practical ideas. In the winter of 1837, in an address on education to

\* The constitution of the Reformed Church at Waynesboro, Pa., contains, amongst other things, the declaration that the church shall be used for the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and that only in the German language, and no other.

the students of the college and citizens of the town, he uttered many profound as well as practical thoughts. "The fortune of our lives," he said to them, "and our government depends not exclusively on useful knowledge but on our character as citizens; and to form this character by cultivating the whole man is the aim of education in the proper sense."

He admired the sturdy character and aggressiveness of the people amongst whom he had come to dwell. He was stimulated by their good, hard common sense and encouraged by the eager manner in which they rallied to the support of the institutions which he was there to represent. He was much gratified at the readiness with which they were prepared to join hands with the sponsors of the college in the cause of higher education.

Around about Dr. Rauch and his assistants in college and seminary from 1836 to 1841, were gathered many young men. Most of them were the sons of German-Americans. In 1840 they numbered 130. Many of them found temporary homes amongst the townspeople. They joined in the social life of the community, shared in the gayety and disputed seriously upon the religious views which the Scotch-Irish maintained in accordance with the strict tenets of their faith. As students—many of them of theology—they were in position to accept and assimilate the best that was in the social and home life of the community.

Even in later years we can imagine the sophomore, his brain fairly bursting with "historical development," taking his Scotch-Irish friend aside in earnest and ardent argument until both would good-naturedly acknowledge that the argument *pro tanto* had no saving grace, for both were hopelessly lost!

While the Covenanters of the little brick church down in the village devoted themselves on the Sabbath day solemnly to the worship of God, the German students were gathered in the chapel on the hill, or wandering through the woods and

fields preaching and learning of God and his wonderful works. The former sang their praises, led only by a human voice; the latter praised the Lord upon the harp, and showed themselves joyful before the Lord, "with trumpets also and with shawms."

And true it is that the precepts of Presbyterianism and the "Principle of Protestantism" were for many a long year as sweet bells out of tune.

Among the students there were excellent performers upon such musical instruments as the flute, violin and clarionet. Dr. Rauch himself was a skilful pianist. On one occasion, as though in protest against the inroads of the German musicians, there came a strolling Scotchman with his bagpipe. He was dressed, it is said, in his provincial costume, and his picturesque appearance together with the old familiar music, delighted townsmen and gowmsmen alike with the memories of Burns and Bannockburn.

Services in the seminary were conducted in later years also with the same life and spirit as in the days of Rauch. Under Dr. Schaff, the singing was accompanied by musical instruments, and the German anthems were rendered with good effect. The Apostles' Creed and liturgical forms were used even before the great contest upon this question in the church at large.

The services at times reached far beyond anything that the old Covenanters were accustomed to, and many a staid Presbyterian felt called upon to criticize.

And yet Dr. Schaff had many warm friends among the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. Among them was Dr. John McDowell, the family physician, a man of blunt humor and large physical proportions. He became a champion of Mercersburg theology, and finally united with the church.

Dr. Schaff visited the Rev. Theodore Hoffeditz, who was on his death-bed. Upon taking his leave, Dr. Schaff said, "When you get to heaven give my love to your father." This remark

set some people to talking, and they reported it to Dr. McDowell as something quite improper.

"That's all right," was the bluff reply, "Dr. Schaff knew very well that this was the only chance he would ever have of sending a message to heaven from that neighborhood, and thought it best to improve the opportunity."

One ought not, however, to venture upon an anecdote of college life without an apology. If a favorite professor in college or seminary does not in a reasonable time develop a tendency to absent-mindedness, preoccupation or peculiarities of some sort, the students will invent something in that direction adequate, in their opinion, to the dignity and learning of the man. But in touching upon this subject, we can never feel sure to what era, this side of Noah's time, we are indebted for our fossils.

The mental or peculiarly intellectual side of this theme has to do with the transfusion of thought. And it is more difficult of approach than the other side, to those of us who are not teachers and doctors of philosophy and who have not kept as closely under the shades of our *alma mater* as we should.

The effort to define it is often futile. Reasoning upon it is elusive, and any attempt to bring it within the range of common simple terms is apt to breed monotony and vain repetitions.

Dr. Rauch was reaching out towards the light, but he did not comprehend it, or "breathe freely," as he says, until the coming of Dr. Nevin.

It is indeed to the singular introduction of this scholar of Presbyterian ancestry into the institutions of pronounced German mould that we owe in a large measure the successful outcome of the language problem.

"Though not of German birth," he says, "I feel a sort of kindred interest in that people, which could hardly be stronger were I one of themselves. My childhood and youth were spent in close familiar communication with German manners

and modes of thought. In later life my attention has been turned to their language and literature. These have awakened in me a new interest in their favor, and brought me into more extensive fellowship with the peculiarities of the national mind."

These were the elements that attracted the mind of Dr. Rauch, and it seems to me that Dr. Nevin unconsciously defined his own important position in the general language movement, when in speaking of Dr. Rauch in eulogy, he said:

"He knew that a simple transfer of German thought into English forms of expression was not what the interests of learning required in this country, but that it is only by being reproduced in new creations by a mind transfused with their inward power, and at the same time at home in the American element of thought, that they can be expected to become truly and permanently valuable."

What is that mysterious spirit preserved to us from the German learning and transfused and transmitted in English forms of expression?

How do we define that something which gives to this and succeeding generations the riches of German literature and learning—even to those who do not understand or employ the mechanical or skeleton-like forms of the German language?

Questions like these are not to be answered within the time allotted to us on this occasion. But however it may be, we can say this: the portals of old Marshall College formed the point of confluence from which the German and English life and thought have flown on together; not the one absorbing the other, but the comingling of both, in the process of which and in the logic of events, the English language survives as the fittest medium of expression. Not the recognition of the German as the dominant language which had hitherto accomplished a division of our intellectual forces, but the adoption of English by which we have gained unity of thought and purpose.

He who thinks himself worthy to examine any movement in the history of our own institutions, and rests content with simply concentrating his thought about the names and personality of Rauch and Nevin and Schaff, does grievous injustice to the memory of these men. He attributes to them honor which they never assumed for themselves. He is like one who would judge of the beauty, the symmetry and the true worth of a forest by merely gazing at the tops of a few of the tallest trees.

I would not wish to be regarded as having attempted anything more than to point out the seemingly incongruous conditions existing at a time when a very considerable body of German-Americans were about to pass from disaffection and unrest into unity and peace through the influence of our educational policies; when our church instead of being merged into other religious systems, was about to be sustained and allowed to grow in its own historical life.

Were we permitted to extend the limits of our theme beyond this, many master minds would appear upon the scene who were essential to the rounding out and development of this great movement, by reason of their own peculiar talents and commanding influence.

Thus the influence of poetic imagination in putting life into the dry skeletons of history, or more properly speaking at this point, in tempering and popularizing the product of severely logical and philosophic minds, has come to be duly appreciated.

It may not be out of place to illustrate the thought in a way that carries with it the home feeling and old acquaintance.

You will perhaps recall that Dr. Nevin said: "Virtue is a substantial real essence, not merely a theory or intellectual notion or abstraction, such a view, however, making room for substantial growth in virtue and excluding the conception of a mechanical aggregation of external activities."

When we speak of excluding the conception of a mechanical

aggregation of external activities, the average mind would call for a third reading, and it was just such a proposition as this that called forth from our own poet and theologian of German ancestry, the remark: "We must take these chunks and work them up for the people."

This was a rugged way of grasping a large thought, and in it we may see how promptly the poet's mind turned back to the life in his mountain home, bringing forward the homely analogy of the knots of hickory and hearts of oak which had to be worked up with maul and wedge before they were in condition to serve their whole purpose.

This recalls to us the names of two men whose lives and spirits were in a peculiar sense a part of our institutions. And it is eminently fitting to this text that one of these bards should be of Scotch-Irish ancestry, and the other a deeply religious and poetic life that sprang through heredity from the very heart of the Swiss Mountains.

The former knew as his birthplace the northern side of Franklin County in the Cumberland Valley, amid such scenes as he himself recalls in that beautiful poem, "Middle Spring Church"—

"Nurtured thou wast hard by yon mountain's height,  
Which now the distance does in azure steep;  
Whose base with laurels, moss and fern is dight,  
Where through its gap the gladsome waters leap."

The latter awoke to conscious life in the midst of moaning pines and the rugged hills of South Mountain, not twenty miles away. The one became a master of technical construction in literature and poetry, and a lyric poet of a high order, while the other was a creative genius, an interpreter of nature, ever imparting life and warmth to those things in which other "minds could discover naught but a barren waste."

What a deep and unpayable debt of gratitude we owe to the first named of these! William M. Nevin was the true and

beautiful exponent of the simple life long before the idea had been run into the realm of the ridiculous in this land; and it is mirrored forth in his own exquisite lines from Horace:

"As happy lives the lowely swain whose board no wassail stains;  
Whose salt-dish kept with pious care, his highest wealth contains;  
For on his eyelids all the night the softest slumbers stay,  
Without a fear, or sordid wish, to banish them away."

Let me come to a close in the words of that other poet of ours, more in line with the theme which has been so imperfectly unfolded to you on this occasion:

"'Tis believed by all believing,  
That great God himself is weaving!  
Bringing out the world's dark mystery  
In the light of faith and history;  
And as warp and woof diminish  
Comes the grand and glorious finish—  
When begin the golden ages,  
Long foretold by seers and sages."

CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

### III.

## THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE FRENCH CHURCHES.

BY LOUISE SEYMOUR HOUGHTON.

### II.

The Associations law created a new condition, and but for one provision it would have gained universal applause. A special provision, however, was made with respect to associations whose members live in common. Such associations, evidently in a different category from a literary, social or political club, a benevolent society or a business company, were required not merely to make a declaration before a court, but to obtain legislative sanction under somewhat severe conditions. Manifestly the religious congregations fell under this second category. With their religious vows the government had nothing to do: it was not religious vows, but the life in common, which in the eye of the law differentiated them from other associations. These orders, including about 45,000 men and a much larger number of women, enormously wealthy, holding that power over the peasantry which inheres in large land ownership, and neither remunerated nor recognized by the State, formed, as M. Yves Guyot a number of years ago said in *Le Siècle*, "a State within the State, capable of undermining the most solid edifice raised by a most united people."

In the course of the debate on this bill—often violent and acrimonious to a high degree, the monarchic and clerical party fighting every step of the way, a measure was enacted which greatly increased the animosity of the opposition. By it the crucifixes and all other religious emblems were removed from court houses, schools and all other public edifices which were

not religious. The measure was not a law, simply a decision of the Chamber of Deputies without concurrence of the Senate, and it gave color to the clerical opposition of the associations bill as a wanton attack upon religion. The opposition of this party, however, merely hastened the adoption of the law.

It will be remembered that after the passage of this law M. Waldeck-Rousseau retired from the government and M. Combes assumed the reins of power. With the elections of May 1902 a change had come over France. By the express will of the country the balance of power was shifted, and for the first time in the history of the third Republic, the radical party came to the front. It was a solemn hour for the party and for the Republic. While it was in opposition this party had taken an attitude which had won it the confidence of the country. Some of the finest minds in France were among its leaders, Jules Jaurès, Francis de Pressensé, Buisson. Though still numerically small it now, by a skilful combination with the three socialist parties, held the balance of power. The Cabinet, however, was not radical, though including some radical members.

Under these conditions, Emile Combes was the man for the hour. *Persona non grata* though he was to the radicals, he and he alone, perhaps, had the qualities which could save religion to France. More profoundly than any other he understood the difficulty of the religious question; on the one hand he recognized the necessity of the religious idea for the permanence of republican institutions, and on the other, he understood the spirit and organization of the Catholic Church. More than this, he had one quality which his colleagues lacked. He was that person, hated and despised by ultramontanes, suspected by radicals and doubted by moderates, an unfrocked priest; but by that very fact he was a man who had passed through a tremendous soul crisis, none the less intellectual and moral for being entirely religious. He knew, as few others in that Chamber of Deputies knew, the passionate al-

legiance, the whole-souled self-abandonment, which binds the priest to his church; he knew, as few of them knew, the deep soul-stirrings, the awful self-questionings, the agonizing conviction of his country's ills, which had forced him, as they were forcing others, to abandon the career of his life, the church of his allegiance. Emile Combes had that which also his colleagues lacked—an intimate personal acquaintance with the religious problem as a question not only of personal eternal life and death, but of the present life or death of the Republic of France. Like the prophet Hosea, his own life story and the story of his country were so intensely blended that he seemed to have lost the faculty of distinguishing between them.

Unquestionably he exaggerated the danger to which his country was exposed, or rather, he unduly identified the menace offered it by the Catholic Congregations with that of ultramontane politics in alliance with the legitimate influence of the Church. Although, as he said in that epoch-making Auxerre address which brought the question of the abrogation of the Concordat into the field of practical politics, M. Combes looked forward to a divorce between Church and State, "not in hostility to the Christian conscience, but in a spirit of social peace and religious liberty," it was assuredly well that he ceased to be president of the Council before the final struggle came. But for the bravery and—however newspaper reports may seem to deny it—the moderation, of the initial steps to rid France of a festering sore which was consuming her vitals, France is forever indebted to Emile Combes. He it was who gave to the religious politics of France a spirit, a method, a direction, from which the most favorable outcome might be hoped.

The Pope made no public utterance about the Associations law, partly because the Congregations were not under the Concordat, and also because though directly under papal authority, it had been convenient for Rome to refrain from ever formally recognizing them; partly also, perhaps, because his name was not Pius X. but Leo XIII.

In his ministerial declaration as President of the Ministry of Public Worship Mr. Combes made his position perfectly clear. Anti-clericalism was not to be actively in the program of the radical government; every violation of either the letter or the spirit of the Concordat was to be rigorously punished. Neither the Associations law nor the abrogation of the Falloux law was due to his own or to radical initiative. Both were measures of the moderate government of M. Waldeck-Rousseau. The only original step left to the radical government was the separation of Church and State. It was not a question of a political triumph over the Church—that would have been easy enough—but of the idea incarnate in the Church, rather than monopolized by her.

In a speech before the Senate in 1901, M. Combes had already spoken of the religious idea as "one of the grandest ideas, and the most potent moral forces, of humanity," and thereby he had recognized its necessity. With his views as to the relation of this idea to the State many of the clergy are in harmony.

Waldeck-Rousseau had been rather favorably disposed toward the Congregations. M. Combes was openly hostile to them, and it was he who farther limited their power by obtaining a decree in Council, subjecting them to the authority of the bishops. Concerning this decree M. Charmes, that very astute observer of political movements, writing in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, said, that it was the moving spring of all the disturbances which followed. If there had been only the law, the Congregations would have submitted, but they simply refused to recognize the authority of the bishop of the diocese. This M. Charmes, who, with the *Revue*, is strongly clerical, found to create a grave situation, since it makes the regular clergy (conventual—under a *regula*) subordinate to the secular clergy, which is an intolerable situation and in fact a revolution. No wonder the Congregations are greatly moved, adds M. Charmes. Still though he dis-

approved the law he advised the congregation to submit. The law was bad, but Rome had said (by Cardinal Giotti, July 10) that it was possible to submit.

This advice, however, was followed only in part. The opposition to the execution of the Associations law, though fierce and sufficiently extensive, was not nearly so important as the newspaper reports seemed to show. Of the 16,460 monastic or conventual institutions, 8,800 sought, and most of them received, authorization. The remaining 7,660 made no request for it and were dissolved, most of them without the slightest opposition. Six hundred establishments, however, were selected at strategic points to resist, with the intent to embarrass the government. Most of these were in Brittany, where the people have all the bigotry of ignorance, and are by nature highly dramatic. The majority of them were associations of women, as making the most pathetic appeal.

The resistance was not the less effectual for not being in all cases open. Many of the associations which, not having asked for authorization, had been dissolved and their members scattered, quietly returned and under another name resumed their former work. In 1903 it was estimated that several thousand schools had again been opened under these conditions. The immediate result was the introduction of a bill for the closing of all schools under the control even of authorized congregations. Against this bill not only the bishops protested in letters to President Loubet, but even the Pope, in a public discourse, made his protest. There was immense agitation, but it simply hastened the passage of the bill.

The tumultuous opposition to the execution of the Associations law naturally hastened the abolition of the Concordat, but it is the most superficial of errors to suppose that M. Combes entered upon this path as a method of retaliation or punishment. The movement, on the contrary, did not originate with the government. It was started in 1902 by the Abbé Bessède, and supported by other priests of the "new

Catholic" school, as a measure of relief from episcopal oppression. Its roots, however, reach much farther back. In 1848 a committee was appointed by the Constituent Assembly to propose a report on the relations of Church and State, as entirely a Church measure. It proposed the election of the bishops by the clergy, to be confirmed by the State, thus setting aside the Pope and creating a Gallican Church. This was a very orthodox committee, and but for the *Coup d'Etat*, it is highly probable that the abrogation of the Concordat might have been effected under circumstances most favorable for the Church.

Farsighted statesmen had long recognized separation as inevitable. It is contrary to the nature of things for a republic to include within itself departments of government ruled by a foreign power. Edouard de Pressencé, pastor and life Senator, said a quarter century ago that the sun of the twentieth century would not rise upon the Concordat. Undoubtedly a bill to abolish it was in M. Combes' program when he came to power. But if it had not been, he could not have resisted the current of feeling, after the open opposition of the Congregations. Disestablishment bills from the last degree of severity to a wise liberality simply poured into the Chamber of Deputies. The government appointed a committee of thirty-three to study them all and bring in one which would stand a chance of being passed, while yet safeguarding the rights of all concerned. The committee was an important one, containing a majority of Catholics, a large minority of Freethinkers and two Protestants. The Briand bill was the result.

Speaking in support of this bill M. Combes said that it did not claim to be perfect, though it was as good as the committee could make it; it would surely be amended and he hoped that every amendment would be in the direction of justice and liberty. This hope was realized. The bill as passed was far less drastic, far more liberal, than its framers would have

dared to offer to the Chamber, some of its provisions being, in view of the peculiar dangers with which the government has to reckon, almost dangerously generous.

The Associations law had been a necessary prelude to the Separation bill, since it was essential to define the theory of association and make the public understand that a religious association stood upon the same footing before the law as any other, with neither special disabilities nor special privileges. Thanks to that great, and till his death misunderstood, moderate-republican, Waldeck-Rousseau, freedom of association had become a reality in France. This law marked the last stage of the evolution which prepared France for separation. It might come sooner or later, it was sure to come.

When the bill was introduced it was expected to be a matter of years. Its coming, however, was hastened by certain political events. Seventy-four bishops signed a manifesto in favor of the Congregations, and were therefore denounced as abusing privilege. The manifesto was sent individually to the Senators and deputies without observance of the prescribed forms, was printed in the *Semaine Religieuse* of most of the dioceses, and copied into most departmental papers. Its character, therefore, was not that of a petition to the Chamber, but of an episcopal manifesto. As such it was a breach of the Concordat, which forbade ecclesiastics to take collective action, or any action outside their diocese, without express permission of government.

The bishops acted in the matter with more tact than courage. They knew their only protection was in public opinion, since the act was illegal. They, therefore, did not sign the manifesto until after publishing it, when, finding it not generally approved, they were able to assert that the *Univers* had published the document without authority. For some time no bishop signed it, and no one knew who wrote it. It was attributed to Abbé Birot, who alone was clever enough to do it, and who had recently made a reputation at the Bourges Congress of priests, and later, by a book.

The protest was not without precedent. Doupanloup, the famous bishop of Orleans, whose centenary the Church had just been celebrating, had in 1852 protested against Felix Veuillot, editor of the *Univers*, and had secured a number of signatures. At that time it was the Church that opposed collective action. The Cardinal Archbishop of Reims, Gousset, and many of the clergy protested against Doupanloup's act as contrary to the rule of the Church, which forbids collective action without the previous intervention of the Pope. On both accounts, therefore, the bishops were in rebellion.

M. Combes did nothing rash. He first wrote to the bishops warning them, and asking them to send to him as soon as possible such mitigating observations as they might be able to urge. This request was unheeded, and M. Combes, as Minister of Public Worship, suppressed the salaries of five of the leaders, one of them Cardinal Perraud, Bishop of Autun. Immediately the Catholic people of Autun took up for him a contribution of 30,000 francs—three times his salary.

Among other dramatic incidents of this episode was the refusal of Monseigneur Chapon, Bishop of Nice, to accept the cross of the Legion of Honor which had lately been offered to him. He also formally complained because his salary had not been suppressed, since he had not only signed the manifesto but had done all in his power to assure its success. M. Combes, penetrated with the justice of his complaint, hastened to cut off his salary. None of his episcopal brethren followed Mgr. Chapon's patriotic example.

The next act in the drama was the very undiplomatic act of Pope Pius X. in notifying President Loubet that his visit to the King of Italy would be construed as an affront to himself. This was a distinct breach of the Concordat, which very clearly defined the relations between the Papal See and the French government. The contract was not less flagrantly broken when the Pope summoned to Rome the two "Liberal" bishops of Dijon and Laval, Mgr. Le Nordez and Mgr. Geay,

communicating with them directly and not through the French government, without whose permission, according to the Concordat, French bishops may not leave French territory. It was after their reluctant obedience to the papal mandate that President Loubet notified the curia that the presence of an Ambassador from the Vatican at the French Capitol no longer served any useful purpose. Diplomatic relations being thus broken off by the Pope's own act, his complaint, formulated in his February encyclical, that he has not been regularly informed of the abrogation of the Concordat, is somewhat gratuitous.

Notwithstanding the bitter denunciations of that document, it had been believed that the Pope would look with complacency upon the abrogation of the Concordat, since it would give him a free hand with the French bishops, and thus greatly enhance his influence in the French Church. Some color is lent to this conjecture by the haste of the Pope to fill the vacant sees. On the eleventh of February he issued his encyclical in which he "solemnly denounces and condemns" the Separation law, and on the twelfth he appointed nineteen new bishops of the Catholic Church in France.

However much may be left to be desired in the details of the Separation bill, it is certain that it is in the line of evolution of legislation, which has always tended to the laicization of the public service. The care of the poor and the sick, the education of the young, once essentially functions of the Church, have one by one passed into the hands of the State, not one of them without a struggle. The Church has tenaciously held to her rights, from no ignoble motive but from an honest conviction that the eternal salvation of multitudes depended upon her controlling these functions. The great struggle of 1901 over the Associations law was largely motivated by this conviction, most sincerely held. Thousands of conventual establishments were educational, and the Church could not see her way to submit the religious education of the chil-

dren to the care of the State. The laicization of Church government is the latest and apparently the final act in this evolution, and it is not surprising that the Church resents it. Unhappily, it is not surprising. Far better would it be for the Catholic Church and for society if the Church would recognize the historic fact that all previous advances along the line of evolution have been for the larger good, and so find reason to hope that they will be in this case.

The Senate passed the Separation bill precisely as it came from the Chamber, without amendment, not by reason of hostility to the Churches, but rather the contrary. To amend the bill would have been to send it back to the Chamber. In that case it could not have gone through before the close of the session, and its completion would have been left for the new legislature, which was to be elected in May, and which would presumably be far more hostile to the Catholic Church than the one which passed the bill. But though the Senate made no amendments, the long discussion was not fruitless. The friends of religion secured from the Ministry the interpretation of several articles in the sense of larger consideration for the welfare of the churches. These interpretations, which would have presumably have been refused to the Catholics, were granted to the representatives of the Protestant churches, to whom, therefore, the Catholics owe and acknowledge the ameliorations which they now enjoy.

Although the law contains many difficult provisions, it offers to the Protestant and the Jewish churches no such difficulties as the Catholic Church finds in it, because their principles are democratic and in their government the laity already have a large share. To submit to government inspection and control, therefore, however painful in certain cases it may be, is not contrary to their fundamental principles; but the idea that the civil government can have any right in or authority over the Church is essentially antagonistic to that hierarchical idea which, as the Pope states in his encyclical, is the funda-

mental principle of the Catholic Church. The very head and front of the offending of the law is not that it makes "the Church free in a free State," but that it creates "the independent Church in a neutral and sovereign State." So far as the law is concerned each individual church is an association by itself, autonomous and independent. It may become a member of a union of associations—as the Congregational churches lately became in this country; or it may become one of a federation of unions, somewhat analogous to the Pan-Protbyterian Union of the world; but neither of these conditions in the slightest degree corresponds to the hierarchical conception of the Church which is that of Rome.

"Hence these tears." They are far from being worthy of a Church which has always been wise to discover a way to make the best of adverse circumstances. Unquestionably it soon will find a better way than those unseemly conflicts which are now taking place, so far beneath the dignity of a Church that claims, and with so much of truth, to be universal.

In the other established churches the sudden removal of pressure, the gift of unexpected freedom after a hundred years of bondage, naturally created a reaction at first difficult to control. The semi-episcopal government of the Lutheran Church, and its concentration in two localities, have saved it from serious trouble; the Protestant and Jewish churches are divided on questions of organization, but there is nothing undignified in their attitude, and their obedience to the law is entire. The position of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, is lamentable, one that can hardly be contemplated without sadness. Opposition did not at first manifest itself with regard to lay government, but was concentrated upon the question of the inventory, a measure so manifestly essential that it was voted with little opposition and almost without debate, as a guarantee to the Church that the new associations—which in very many places would almost certainly be freethinking—should not divert church property from its original purpose. It was

indeed almost wholly a measure of simple business prudence. The new religious associations would certainly need, and would have the right, to know the nature and amount of the property of which they were to be custodians.

The inventories have on the whole been made with great tact. The newspapers had recorded the fact that 2,200 churches had been inventoried before the gilded youth of the St. Roch Church in Paris found it to be their pleasure to resist. Their example was not unnaturally followed at Ste. Clotilde and in many provincial churches. The tocsin was rung, doors and windows were barricaded, and all sorts of arms brought into play, from crucifixes to pepper. The government agents could hardly do otherwise than use force—the fire-engine being their principal weapon. Private letters describe them as acting with singular patience, though with no evidence of sympathy with the recalcitrants. The Catholic press uttered loud cries of theft, spoliation, persecution. Some of the articles were outrageous. The curé of St. Sulpice was characterized as odious because he accepted the law with good will. It is difficult to see what the church gained by this course. It simply furnished weapons to the anti-clericals.

It is true that certain articles of the law are somewhat difficult of interpretation, as was manifested by the questions put to the ministry during the Senate debate. Articles III.—VIII., regulating the transference and possession of property certainly leave room for some anxiety as to the final destination of such property as was never their actual possession, but which churches by long enjoyment have come to think their own. To say, as the opposition papers said, that the inventory is a mere pretext for spoliation, was to say what, to any one who had read the text of the law, was manifestly untrue; but it can easily be understood that those who desired to embarrass the government would take advantage of such statements to stir up the more ignorant to resist with violence

an inventory which they had been told was the mere prelude to spoliation.

The principle of Catholic opposition, however, is honorable, however reprehensible the acts of some individuals. M. Brunetière in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and Count D'Haussonville, by his pamphlet "After Separation" (*Après la Séparation*) have done much to bring Catholics to a better mind. That there was a right-minded minority was shown in the meeting of the five cardinal bishops of Paris, Lyons, Bordeaux, Rennes and Autun, who were agreed in thinking it right for priests and people to lend themselves to the application of the law. On the other hand, the Archbishop of Chambéry and others solemnly protested against the inventory, saying that only the Pope could permit it, and more than insinuating that the purpose was to take Church property for the profit of the State. This is distinctly and flagrantly untrue.

After making careful provision for the disposition of property under all conceivable circumstances, Article XI. is inserted to provide that "The appropriation provided by the preceding articles in no case gives occasion for any acquisition of profit to the treasury."

If the difference between the *fabrique* or canonical council which formerly held church property, and the *associations culturelles* of the new law for whose security these inventories are taken, were clearly understood, the laity would no doubt approve of the new order, by which they themselves are enabled to control the use of the contributions they make to the Church. This is all the more essential, now that the entire support of the great hierarchical institution, and all its large and far-reaching activities, must come directly from them. That the idea of the laity controlling the appropriation of church funds is so foreign to the episcopal mind, simply proves how far the organization of the Church has lagged behind the world in the march of thought and experience. Some provisions of the law are unreasonable and unduly restrictive of common rights, but

the way to mend matters is not by resistance but by legislation. The law is capable of amendment, and it was passed with the full understanding that it would be amended. In the matter of property rights it already makes careful provision for appeal to the courts, in some cases without expense to the complainant, and all the transfers of property are to be effected without expense to the churches.

The Abbé Hemmer, in a very weighty pamphlet, *Religious Politics and Separation* ("Politique Religieuse et Séparation"), expressed the belief that the policy of resistance would be checked by the Pope. The encyclical of February 11 might possibly be understood in this sense, but it was ambiguous, Catholics were counseled to enter upon no policy of resistance unless firmly united among themselves; counsel which offers two interpretations.

Such a retaliatory measure as was adopted by Cardinal Turinaz of Nancy, followed by a few others, in refusing to pronounce during divine service the sentence "Lord save the State," is simply purile. It was never ordered by the State, and, as Abbé Hemmer observes, it is simply commanded by the Christian conscience.

In 1848 the movement for the abrogation of the Concordat came from the Church, and was designed to limit the power of the State. The present measure ought at least to satisfy the bishops. With scrupulous care the law maintains the episcopal authority, by providing (Article IV.) that the *associations cultuelles* must be organized in conformity with the general rule of the Church whose service they desire to continue. Under this rule, the bishop, and not the people, nominates the priest, and he who formerly was irremovable now holds his place at the pleasure of the bishop. The first case in point occurred at Cula, in the diocese of Verdun, where the Abbé Hutin, one of the "new Catholics," was curé. He was greatly beloved, and the people desired his ministrations, but the bishop suspended him and sent another in his place. The people

stand by Abbé Hutin, whose successor, however, is in possession of church and presbytery, or parsonage. The people have written a sharp letter to the bishop, abjuring his authority. They will probably form a new church, and the property question will be a nice one. An *association cultuelle* formed without the bishop's sanction cannot claim it, Article IV. being in the way, and no one in the commune consents to belong to the *association cultuelle* with the new abbé for priest, which alone can hold it. Such cases are occurring in various parts of the country, even where the people are "practicing" Catholics. They will be still more difficult where the people are free-thinkers, anti-clericals or atheists.

The Concordat, being an agreement between two parties—the French Government and the Papal See—could remain in force only so long as both parties were agreed. It was not like a deed of property made once for all, but was a continually active force in the life of the Church in its relations with the State. To produce the desired effect it was necessary that the relations of both parties should be cordial. Pius IX. and Antonelli had both said that the Concordat is not a bilateral theory but a concession of the papacy, made under the pressure of circumstances, and which could be withdrawn whenever the Pope saw fit. The acts of Pius X. in the matter of the two bishops and the Italian journey were virtually a withdrawal of consent. He did indeed, in his February encyclical, protest against the Separation law as abolishing an agreement which may be set aside only by mutual consent, being apparently oblivious of the real force of his own conduct in those two cases.

Leo XIII., who, while not the equal of his successor in simple piety and loyalty to the truth as he sees it, was not only one of the finest minds but one of the most subtle diplomats of his time, laid it upon the French clergy to be loyal to the Republic. This counsel they surely have not obeyed: they failed to see as he saw that the temporal interests of the

Church demand such loyalty. Perhaps obedience to such counsel was too much to ask of a body of clergy who had been formed by a Church which is an absolute monarchy. Undoubtedly they were also influenced by the French nobility and higher *bourgeoisie*, who are the chief adherents of the Church, and who almost to a man and quite to a woman are passionately monarchical or imperialist; certainly the fact remains that in every great political crisis, boulangism, nationalism, the *Seize Mai* (1873, the latest attempt at restoration) they have always been on the side of the enemies of the Republic, zealously lending to the opposition the support of their enormous influence.

The natural repercussion of clerical intriguing in politics is anti-clericalism. This would be the case on whichever side the Church threw her political strength. But as things were, the anti-clerical movement appealed to that passion for liberty, for republican institutions, which fires the souls of the great mass of the French people. The Associations law gave a radical ministry its opportunity. The law was applied with a severity which was not in the intention of its framers, but for which the resistance of the Congregations gave some color of excuse. From that time it has been war to the knife between the Congregations and the government. The secular clergy, with whom the government had no thought of meddling, were drawn into the conflict. The necessary harmony between the Vatican and the Minister of Worship was broken. There was discord between them on the subject of the formula for the investiture of bishops. Resistance to their nomination by the government became a principle. Every name that M. Combes proposed was refused by the Vatican, so that on the first of last January there were nineteen vacant sees, and matters were brought to a head by the Italian incident and the unauthorized summons of the two bishops to Rome. With the recall of the ambassadors the rupture was actually complete. Only one of two things remained possible; either a

new concordat or separation of Church and State. The era of concordats is past. A new one would be an anachronism. Under the existing situation the Church in France was at a dead-lock, such ecclesiastical acts as the filling of the vacant bishoprics being impossible. Separation was inevitable.

The suppression of the budget of worship was the natural consequence of the law. So far as the Protestant and Jewish churches are concerned, the legality of the measure is not questioned, but the Catholic Church claims that the salaries of the clergy may not be legally taken from them, since they are the payment of a just debt, incurred in 1789 when ecclesiastical property was confiscated for the benefit of the State. This position, stoutly maintained by the clergy, has, however, never been admitted by any government, not even by the Monarchy, still less by the Empire, and it is certainly contrary to Republican principles.

As originally drafted the Separation bill made too meager provision for ministers of the various churches, and it was amended in the direction of much greater liberality. Not as the payment of a debt, but as a measure of public utility, the ministers were not to be cast penniless upon the world, nor cast too abruptly upon the uncovenanted mercies of their parishioners. As the provisions of the law apply alike to ministers of all churches, the Catholic clergy, being unmarried, have an advantage over pastors and rabbis. On the other hand it may be doubted whether their people will make as serious sacrifices for their support, as Protestant and Jewish congregations will do.

The law assigns to all ministers over sixty years of age who have exercised their functions for thirty years, life pensions equal to three-quarters of their salary, though not to exceed \$300 a year. In the case of married ministers the pension reverts to the widow and minor children. Ministers over forty-five who have exercised their functions for twenty years are to have a life pension equal to half their salary, not to

exceed \$300, with revision as in the previous case. All other ministers receiving salaries when the bill was passed are to receive indemnities proportionate to their former salaries, gradually extinguished in four, or in the case of small communes in eight years. Ministers will retain their presbyteries or manses or will have an allowance for lodging. Every church must submit its accounts annually to the proper ecclesiastical tribunal—bishop or synod.

The provisions as to collecting funds and forming a capital are very strict, yet far more generous than as in the bill as first drawn. It seemed necessary to guard against the danger of the Catholic Church amassing treasure for use in a war upon the State, but happily the State has shown more confidence in the good faith of the Catholic people than the framers of the bill thought possible.

How far the Church will justify this confidence, the future must show. The Church looked eagerly to the Pope for guidance, and no strong sure word has as yet come from that quarter for the second encyclical, of July 1, is still ambiguous, and floods of ink have been poured out in attempted interpretation. It appears to condemn the religious associations called for by the law, though there are those who see a way open even through the hedges of the papal utterance.

But wise guides are not wanting. The Count d'Haussonville in his pamphlet urges priests and people to leave to Rome the duty of protesting against "the one-sided rupture of a two-sided contract," and while supporting this protest waste no time in bewailing a past that will probably never return. Let them rather, he counsels, go forth to meet the future thankfully and with confidence; take up the new work with courage, ardor and enthusiasm; let each layman put himself at the service of his bishop or his priest, contribute not only his money but his time and activity to the reorganization of the Church. Thus let the Church become once more the common house, the true home of the people. Let them accept frankly

the conditions of liberty and equality, organizing the Church, from the temporal point of view, on a democratic basis. The Abbé Hemmer wisely warns against the formation of a Catholic party. This, he says, would indeed be an evil for the Church and would gravely compromise the future. The adhesion to the Republic which Leo XIII. counseled has never, he says, been obeyed by the monarchist Catholics. They are too much divided politically to form a party, and if they did succeed, just so soon as they came to power they would try to reunite Church and State, a condition so far removed from the modern conception of religion. Most French Catholics and especially their priests seem powerless to conceive the impotence of political power. They think that is all that is needed to set the ship afloat again, though if they read their history better they would know better.

Wise counsels these, and the last, with its picture of actual conditions, shows how futile is the apparent hope of Pius X., suggested in both his encyclicals that the Catholics of France will make a united stand against the law. Leading minds in the French Church have been divided on the question whether or no to resist with violence; for a time at least the resisters in many cases seemed to be having their way; the riotous resistance to the inventory which made so much stir was certainly not due to popular initiative. M. Brunetière blamed the priests, who encouraged the manifestations. The clerical organ, *Le Courrier de Genève*, tells him that he does not understand the question, repeats that the inventory is intended for the profit of the State, and is simply a preliminary to sacreligious spoliation, and that Catholics "do not need instructions before protesting against a monstrous law of confiscation, illegally applied by an unscrupulous cabinet," but the *Courrier* is simply playing to the galleries. Since the encyclical of July 1 the current seems to be flowing the other way. It was certainly a blunder on the part of the Pope to assume, if he did not declare, that the bishops in their

May Assembly (an assembly made possible only by the abolition of the Concordat) had declared not only against the religious associations of the law, but also against "all other associations at once legal and canonical." The Assembly was held in secret, but it now transpires that precisely the contrary was the action taken. A two-thirds majority voted in favor of "some form of association at once canonical and legal," and a way was proposed by which the existing *fabriques* might be transformed into canonical associations of a character which the law could recognize.

It is difficult to see how this could be done while the Holy See holds its present position, and certainly there is no such state of mind in the French Church as would warrant an attempt to break with Rome. But unless some *modus vivendi* is speedily found conditions will become to the last degree disastrous. The law gave a full year for the reorganization of the civil status of the churches. Unless associations competent to hold property are formed before January 1, 1907, all Catholic Church property becomes by default the property of the State. The result of the State in that case pressing her rights would be something too terrible to contemplate.

Nevertheless, it is certain that the predominant sentiment among French Catholics is in favor of accepting and making the best of the law. A very striking *Supplique* was sent to the Pope the first week in September, imploring him to find a way to reconcile the conflicting duties of loyal Catholics and loyal citizens. The appeal was unsigned, like that other document of which mention has been made, but it contained a pledge that some hundreds of Catholics of reputation were ready to sign it if required. What effect it has had upon the Holy Father's mind time will show.

From out of the ranks of liberal Protestantism comes a voice of hope which also may not be too securely trusted. M. Paul Sabatier's conviction that out of all this tumult of feeling will come "a new Catholicism and a new clergy" which

will save the Church—while it no doubt inspires the zeal of the “new Catholics,” inflames the conservatives to fury. The Bishop of Nancy, Mgr. Turinaz, who a few years ago strongly fulminated against “Protestant infiltrations in the Catholic clergy,” in an open letter of 22 pages, indignantly repudiates the idea. It is natural that the biographer of St. Francis should be hopeful that “the Christianity of to-day with its Pharisees and Sadducees will pass into history and be replaced by a new civilization.” “This will not kill that,” he adds; “this will grow out of that.” This alluring hope rests not alone with the leaders of the new Catholic movement but with those freethinkers with whom, Protestant pastor though he is, M. Sabatier delights to ally himself; men not anti-religious but anti-clerical—men like Edouard Le Roy and Buisson, like M. Fonségrove, the brilliant editor of the *Quinzaine*, and the writers in the new periodical, *Demain*, founded in Lyons since the Separation, in the hope of making it redound to the highest good of the nation. Such men, M. Paul Sabatier thinks, will meet half way the abbés Loisy, Dabry, Klein, Hutin, Monseigneur Duchesne, Canon Chevalier, Father Delahaye, and others of that rapidly growing school and from their united efforts will result the restoration of religion in France. They, rather than the Protestants, must be the saviours of France.

To a degree this is true; the Protestants are so few in number, and so painfully occupied with their own problems. Nevertheless, it is certain that religiously France owes far more to the Protestants, especially since the establishment of the third Republic, than their small numbers—about one in sixty of the population—would promise, and it is not probable that their influence will be long under eclipse. It is always, as Matthew Arnold reminded us, by minorities that nations are saved, and so it may be in this case.

However this may be, it is certain that men like Paul Sabatier, Brunetière, Hemmer, have proved themselves to be better leaders for the time than the man who sits in Peter's

chair. It is said that his first encyclical made a great impression in the Chamber of Deputies when late one afternoon it was brought in. But the impression was one of surprise mainly because the Pope's long silence had lent color to the report that he accepted separation. There seemed to be a general fear of the counter effect of the encyclical on the elections, and no doubt if the Catholics had done nothing to stir up a reaction it probably would have had a serious influence. But such denunciations as those of the Holy Father, unaccompanied by a positive program of action, are not calculated to strengthen Catholicism, either as a Church or as a political party.

NEW YORK.

#### IV.

### JESUS THE GREAT TEACHER.

BY REV. NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, LL.D.

For years Jesus worked at the carpenter's bench, but no one ever called Him a great carpenter. He expounded the law so that men were astonished at His doctrine, but history does not speak of Him as a great lawyer or even as a great law-giver. He healed men and women of their diseases, but no one has ventured to apply to Him the title of the great doctor. We read of Him that He sat and taught; and the best of men delighted to acknowledge Him as the Great Teacher.

At this point it may be well to inquire: What is it that constitutes human greatness? What is it that makes men great? Is it money? Then forsooth we should speak of Gould the Great and Rothschild the Great. In the glorious days when Cicero spoke and Vergil wrote, there were men so rich that they dissolved pearls in goblets of wine to make the drink more costly; but history has never dignified their names with the title Great; only the specialist knows their names. Is it learning that makes men great? Our colleges and universities have had many men of marvelous learning; but their names do not appear in the temple of fame. Charles and Frederic were surely not noted for erudition; yet posterity delights to call them Great. Is it official position that makes men great? A man may fill a seat in Congress and hold high offices in the State, but if he has no other claim to fame, his name will sink into oblivion like the names of hosts of others who have graced or perhaps disgraced the halls of legislation. If neither wealth, nor learning, nor office-holding constitute greatness, what is it that makes men great? Men are great in the degree and to the extent that they exert a moulding influence upon their fellow men.

On the pages of history only two classes of men have been surnamed great, one class consisting of men eminent in the Church, like Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, and the other of men eminent in the State, like Alexander and Charles and Frederic. The Church and the State have been the organizations through which a gifted man could reach the masses of mankind and leave the world different from what he found it. Of all the gifted men that have ever lived, who has so wrought upon the hearts and moulded the lives of mankind as Jesus of Nazareth!

It belongs to the rewards of a teacher's life that he has unparalleled opportunities for exerting a moulding influence upon others during the most plastic period of life. The Great Teacher gave utterance to the profoundest thoughts, clothed them in a garb of the most wonderful simplicity, and secured for them a lodgment in the hearts of men, kindling in them aspirations and stimulating them to actions and sacrifices never known to antiquity. The influence of His teaching has not been confined to one age or to one people; His sayings have born fruit wherever the gospel has been proclaimed and the Church has been established. Very many who do not acknowledge Him as the Messiah celebrate Christmas by gifts to their children and show in other ways how powerfully their thinking and manner of life have been influenced by Jesus of Nazareth.

Dr. Nevin used to say that the ability to found a school was evidence of greatness. Hegel and Herbart founded schools of thought, and for a time each moulded the thinking of a wide circle of followers. The remark of an American observer that each of these philosophers is dead in the land of his birth, must indeed be regarded as an overstatement of fact; nevertheless, their influence is on the wane whilst that of Jesus is ever increasing. The labors and dissertations of the philosopher are for the favored few, for the world's intellectual aristocracy. The Great Teacher never made a distinction between the

masses and the classes; the common people heard Him gladly, and yet the profoundest thinkers have not exhausted the wisdom of His sayings. The diction of His discourses rivals in beauty and effectiveness the best that literature contains; but such is its naturalness that the mind is never drawn from the content to the form in which the idea is enshrined. When He spake, men's hearts burned within them, and thenceforth multitudes of those who heard Him walked as if they were breathing the atmosphere of another world.

If in former centuries the Church and the State were the only channels through which the multitudes could be reached, modern life has opened new avenues through which the sons of genius can reach the nations of the earth and exert an influence upon present and future generations. The printing press and other inventions are among the agencies by which humanity has been lifted to higher planes of living. Through the application of science to the arts men have more and better bread to eat than in former centuries, and the physical well-being of the race has been enhanced in a thousand ways. The seven wonders of the ancient world have been eclipsed by the greater wonders of the nineteenth century. Machinery has been made to do the work of man and beast; and the energies of the race have been directed into new channels. Speaking of the ways in which modern science has enlarged the sphere of human activity, a living writer says: "It has lengthened life; it has shortened distances; it has assuaged pain; it has saved time; it has annihilated space; it has unravelled the mysteries of nature; it has improved agriculture; it has covered the waters with vessels that move without sails and the land with carriages that rush across continents without horses; it has enabled one man to do the work of a hundred; it has turned night into day by the power of illumination; it has seized the lightning and made it the handmaid of man; it has enabled each of us to talk to our friends a thousand miles away as though they were our next-door neighbors; it has

more than realized the boast of Puck that he would 'put a girdle round about the earth in forty minutes.' " \*

The names of those who invented the steam engine, the steamboat and the locomotive are in the mouth of everybody. The men who gave us the telegraph, the phonograph, the electric light and the telephone have revolutionized modern life and done more for humanity than the leaders of armies. The discoveries of anesthetics, of anti-septic surgery, of the X-rays, deserve the lasting gratitude of the present and future generations. In point of greatness the apostles of science and modern invention deserve a more conspicuous place in the temple of fame than the rulers who have occupied thrones and modified the maps of continents. But not one of them has contributed so much to make life worth living as Jesus of Nazareth. Not one of their inventions and discoveries can give the guilty conscience peace, or do aught to enable a human being to lead a life of faith and hope and love. No ruler has done so much to change the relation of man to man and to improve the treatment of inferiors by their superiors; no lawgiver has done so much to quicken the conscience, to establish justice in civil and social life, to stir up an interest in the lot of the sick and the unfortunate, and to free men from the bondage of idolatry and slavery as He who enjoined man to love God with all his soul and strength and mind, and then by the parable of the good Samaritan taught the meaning of the word neighbor in the command: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Marvelous progress in the arts and sciences tends to make us value material luxuries above the things of the higher life. Jesus who fed the thousands by miraculously multiplying the loaves and fishes, did not despise the art of making bread for man's sake; nor would He have *us despise* the arts which grow grain and make bread. But when the tempter wished Him for the gratification of self and in violation of higher laws to

\* Eugene L. Didier in "Self Culture," February, 1898.

turn stones into bread, He replied: It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. He taught His followers to value the things of the higher life above that which stands for what we eat and drink, the garments we wear and the houses we live in. He perfected the view of life that has been held by the wisest teachers of all ages. Plato wrote above the door of his academy: "Let no one enter here who is destitute of geometry," That he did not value the study of geometry simply as a preparation for the study of philosophy is evident from the fact that in one of his dialogues he makes Socrates say: "God geometrizes." Plato had an idea that when a youth thinks the theorems and demonstrations of geometry, he is thinking God's thoughts. When Kepler discovered the laws of planetary motion, he exclaimed: "O God, I think thy thoughts after Thee!" He who unravels the thoughts which the Creator has put into the starry heavens above us and into nature all around us, is learning to think divine thoughts and to taste the luxuries of the higher life.

Higher than the life of thought or mere intellect is the life of faith and hope and love. This is a truth that Jesus impressed indelibly upon the minds of His followers. His language was calculated to inspire confidence in God's ever watchful Providence, even over the minutest details of life. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall upon the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." Assurances of this kind served to strengthen the faith of His disciples and gave them a fearless courage from which it was inferred that they had been with Jesus. Paul, who speaks of himself as one born out of due time and as the least of the apostles, claimed to know that all things work together for good to them that love God. This faith in the Providence of a kind Heavenly Father, overruling the affairs of the individual and

of the world, has been a wonderful support even to the strongest of the race in the hour of trial and darkness. "If I did not believe in the divine government of the world," exclaimed Bismarck, "I would not serve my country another hour. Take my faith from me and you take my country too." Destroy faith and you take away the best that man has to sustain him in the darkest hours of his existence. Faith in God has done more for the race than all the applications of steam and electricity.

For the purpose of awakening the ambition of boys at school and of inciting them to greater exertion, it has been customary to cite the example of men who have risen from the humblest walks of life to the highest offices of State. Orator after orator holds before their eyes the glittering prizes of public life which are open to all in a free land. The hope of inscribing one's name upon the pages of history has inspired to deeds of the greatest daring and bravery. The hope which the Great Teacher put into the hearts of His disciples was not the hope of an immortality on the pages of history, but the hope of an immortality far more real than the immortality in printer's ink. The Christian hopes for an immortality in a world in which the soul shall be robed in a body like unto the Savior's risen body which Stephen saw in a vision of glory and Paul beheld in a manifestation of overwhelming splendor. The Christian's heaven is not a material paradise like that in which the Mussulman hopes to indulge his passions without restraint, but a realm in which righteousness and holiness and love of the purest type shall reign supreme.

In the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, which is a poem, though lacking meter and rhyme, Paul speaks of faith, hope and charity and says that of them the greatest is charity or love, as the Revised Version translates it. Faith shall be changed to sight and hope to glad fruition, but love shall abide forever. Throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity the love of man for his Maker and his Savior and for the whole glori-

ous company of the redeemed will continue to glow and to grow, lifting the soul to ever loftier heights of ecstasy and bliss. Even in this world the love that binds human hearts, makes homes and brotherhoods, and issues in deeds of kindness and charity, is bringing more happiness to the race than all other agencies combined. The following lines penned by an English student, F. W. Bourdillon, have made for their author a reputation on both sides of the Atlantic:

The night has a thousand eyes  
And the day but one;  
Yet the light of the whole world dies  
With the setting sun.

The mind has a thousand eyes  
And the heart but one;  
But the light of a whole life dies.  
When love is done.

The first message of the risen Savior to His disciples was a message of hope and love. It was given to Mary Magdalene in the command: "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father; but go unto my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and unto my God and your God." It reminded them of those teachings which had startled the multitudes and which were in strange contrast with the reigning spirit of the times, especially of those to whom men looked as their leaders and exemplars. Outdo your friends in acts of kindness, your enemies in deeds of evil, was a common maxim in ancient life. Xenophon, a disciple of Socrates, described with apparent approval the ambition of the younger Cyrus that no other man should do more good to his friends or inflict greater harm upon his enemies. It is the way of men of the world to love and reward their friends, to hate and punish their enemies. It was a new view of life which Jesus inculcated when He said: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and perse-

cute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." He taught the universal brotherhood of man and the universal Fatherhood of God. The duty of loving all mankind and of praying for one's enemies, was a new gospel. And when we think of the ears and hands that were cut off, the eyes that were put out and the nameless bodily injuries that were inflicted in the name of revenge, we are constrained to confess that the gospel of Jesus has done more to increase the happiness of mankind and to elevate the condition of the race than all the applications of modern science to the arts and industries of civilized life.

"Jesus of Nazareth," writes Philip Schaff, "without money and arms, conquered more millions than Alexander, Cæsar, Mohammed and Napoleon; without science and learning He shed more light on things human and divine than all scholars and philosophers combined; without the eloquence of the schools He spoke such words of life as were never spoken before or since, and produced effects which lie beyond the reach of any orator or poet; without writing a single line He set more pens in motion, and furnished themes for more sermons, orations, discussions, learned volumes, works of art, and sweet songs of praise than the whole army of great men of ancient and modern times. Born in a manger, and crucified as a malefactor, He now controls the destinies of the civilized world, and rules a spiritual empire which embraces one-third of the inhabitants of the globe. There never was in this world a life so unpretending, modest and lowly in its outward form and condition, and yet producing such extraordinary effects upon all ages, nations and classes of men." \*

Although wealth and learning and official position do not make a man great, they are not to be despised. Rightly used they make it easier to lead the life of thought and faith and

\* Schaff's "Person of Christ," pages 48-49.

hope and love. They are valuable aids in doing good unto others and in wielding an influence for the elevation of mankind. But they are not essential to true happiness or great usefulness. In the counsels of eternity men are not judged upon the basis of what they have but of what they are. The good that Jesus did and the influence that He has wielded through the ages must not be ascribed to anything outside of His Personality. What He did derives its character from what He was. The influence of His life and the effectiveness of His teaching had their source in the wonderful qualities of His Being and Person.

LANCASTER, PA.

# V.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF A KNOWLEDGE OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES TO THE PROPER UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*

BY IRWIN HOCH DE LONG, D.B., PH.D.

At the head of my claim of the importance of a knowledge of the Semitic languages to the proper understanding of the New Testament I call attention to the fact that Jesus was

\* Being the address delivered by the author May 10, 1906, on the occasion of the induction into office as Assistant Instructor in Old Testament Science in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa. The time-limit set by the authorities was twenty minutes.

Of the copious literature dealing with questions touched upon in this paper I have used and consulted in its preparation the following:

H. OORT. De uitdrukking *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in het Nieuwe Testament (1893).

B. D. EERDMANS. De oorsprong van de uitdrukking "zoon des menschen" als evangelische messiasitel, in the important Dutch Theologisch Tijdschrift (1894), pp. 153-176, followed immediately by a "Naschrift," pp. 177-187, by W. C. van Manen, which in turn is followed by Eerdmans, De uitdrukking "zoon des menschen" en het boek "Henoch" (1895), *ibid.*, pp. 49-71.

ARNOLD MEYER. Jesu Muttersprache. Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt (1896).

HANS LIETZMANN. Der Menschensohn (1896); to Lietzmann in Theologische Arbeiten aus dem Rheinischen wissenschaftlichen Prediger-verein, neue Folge, 6 (1899), pp. 194-215, I have not had access.

N. SCHMIDT. Was *בֶּרַךְ מְשִׁיחָא* a Messianic Title? in Journal of Biblical Literature (1896), pp. 36-53; Son of Man, in Encyclopædia Biblica (1903); The Prophet of Nazareth (1905).

GUSTAF DALMAN. Die Worte Jesu (1898).

J. WELHAUSEN. Skizzen und Vorarbeiten VI. (1899), pp. 187-215; Marcus (1903); Lucas (1904); Matthäus (1904); Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien (1905). "Die Kracht van Wellhausen is gelegen in zijne Kennis van het Arameesch en het Syrisch. Vele byzonderheden van taal en stijl meent hij uit het Arameesch te

ethnically and religiously a Semite, not an Aryan.\* He was born of Semitic parentage; reared in a Galilean home, which made no pretensions to learning, in an age when Aramaic was the spoken language. This language belonging to the large and important group of languages known as the Semitic was his mother-tongue. In it he thought, and in it he spoke, and later in life in it he habitually addressed and taught the fishermen of Galilee.

In former times we were all eager to believe that the very Greek words of our Gospels came directly from Jesus' lips, but now it may be questioned whether Jesus had any knowledge whatever of Greek. This question has been carefully and thoroughly discussed and seems to have reached a settled conclusion; historical and philological investigation has shown that the sayings of Jesus, as they have come down to us, are but a translation from the original utterances and that Jesus' knowledge of Greek, if he had any knowledge of Greek at all, was in all probability quite meagre. The Semitic, or more specifically the Aramaic vocabulary, syntax, and idioms are everywhere seen through the Greek of the Gospels, like the earlier text in a palimpsest manuscript. Consequently sound philological and historical criticism demands, as a matter of course,

moeten verklaren, meer dan wij gewoonlijk aannemen. Wij vinden hier de reactie van het streven van den laatsten tijd, om zoo weinig mogelijk Arameesche vormen in het N. Tisch Grieksch te onderstellen, en de zg. Arameïsmen uit de *kovç* te verklaren. In mijnen commentar op Mk., die dit jaar verschijnt, hoop ik aan te toonen, dat ik in den regel niet met Wellhausen kan medegaan. . . . Jammer is, dat hij het Arameesch in den regel transcribeert, wat alleen voor de mannen van het vak geen bezwaar oplevert." J. M. S. Baljon in *Theologische Studien*, Vier en twintigste Jaargang, Aflevering II. (1906), p. 139 ff.

H. P. CHAJES. *Markus-Studien* (1899).

PAUL FIEBIG. *Der Menschensohn* (1901).

S. R. DRIVER. *Son of Man*, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* (1902).

\* Against HAECKEL, *Die Welträthsel*, chap. 17, where he revives the Pandora-Pandora story.—For an interesting and instructive presentation of the onomatological facts of this name see Adolf Deissmann, "Der Name Panthera," in *Orientalische Studien* ["Fest-Schrift" for Theodor Nöldeke], edited by Carl Bezold, vol. 2, p. 871 ff.

that any saying of Jesus reported in a Greek text be, as far as this may still be possible, translated back into the Aramaic original before the interpreter or exegete pronounces his final verdict upon the meaning of such sayings. In a few instances the Aramaic original has been retained. I call attention only to Mk. 5:41: *ταλειθά κούμ* (some texts offer *κούμ*), *ܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܬܝܠܐ*; Mk. 7:34: *ἐφφαθά*, *ܦܬܬܬܐܬܐ* or rather *ܦܬܬܐܬܐ*, the usual contraction of the Ethpeel in the Babylonian Talmud;\* Mk. 15:34 (Mt. 27:46): *Ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ*, *ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܡܐ ܨܒܚܬܐܢܝ*. It is of interest to note for our purpose that Ps. 22:1 in Hebrew reads *יְהוָה עֲבֹד*, but the Greek transliteration presents the characteristic Aramaic *ܦܨܬ*. It is simply evidence that Jesus was thoroughly Aramaic in speech, for the language that men speak in moments of great suffering of body or agony of mind is always that with which they are most familiar, their mother-tongue. In the preceding examples, which are more or less correct transliterations, it is a comparatively easy matter to get back to the original. When the translated sayings of Jesus, reported in the Greek language of our New Testament are approached, the work of retranslation is not always an easy matter for a number of reasons. Beset with difficulties as this process often is, nevertheless, sound *textual* and *historical* criticism rightly demands that this be done before the saying is interpreted. Here I call attention to the phrase in the Greek New Testament, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, as an example of the sayings of Jesus, reported in Greek, one among others, that can only rightly be interpreted by a retroversion into the Aramaic original. For the purpose in hand it is not necessary to do more than to state the main facts in this complicated problem and to indicate the general results of the application of a sound philological method to the study of the saying mentioned.

\* For "A Grammar of the Aramaic idiom contained in the Babylonian Talmud" see *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vols. XIII. (1896), pp. 21-78; 118-139; 177-208; XIV. (1897), 17-37; 106-128; 195-206; 252-266; XV. (1898), 224-243; XVI. (1899), 83-199; by Professor C. Levias.

Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου retranslated into the original = בר נשא. This phrase occurs in by far the majority, if not in all the Aramaic dialects and signifies no more and no less than the Greek ὁ ἄνθρωπος, human being, man. It also has the force of an indefinite pronoun, "one," "some one," like the Greek τῷ. The Arameans, like the Hebrews, designate the individual either by "man" or "woman"; for the concept man, *homo*, they originally have only a collective. This collective may, however, be individualized by placing before it בר or בן. Thus בקר signifies "cattle, herd," but בן בקר "an individual of the herd," so אדם and נשא "human beings, homines," but אדם בן and בר נשא a single individual of the class of human beings. Between the Aramaic and the Hebrew there is, however, this difference which has to be noted, the Hebrew בן אדם is an unusual expression, while the Aramaic בר נשא is comparatively general and common.

The importance of the fact that Jesus spoke Aramaic and said בר נשא lies in this, that it was impossible for him to make the distinction between ὁ ἄνθρωπος and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which is maintained in the Greek Gospels. This distinction is then not original, not authentic, and was only made by later interpreters, translators, and redactors of the gospel tradition. In the language of Jesus ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (= בר נשא) signifies the same as ὁ ἄνθρωπος. It is of importance for the *historical* interpreter not to lose sight of this philological fact. "Son of man" has no other meaning than man. It is apparently a literal translation from the Aramaic original, but a translation which in reality leads astray. In the present Greek Gospels ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is only used as a designation of Jesus, a designation which he in reality has not himself assumed, because it is a philological or linguistic impossibility. In the language spoken by Jesus the phrase could only mean "man" in the generic sense, with no implied claim to Messiahship.

Let us now turn to a few of the reported sayings of Jesus in

which this phrase, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, occurs. In Mk. 2:10 we meet Jesus' assertion that בֶּר נִשָּׂא i. e., man, has a right to pardon sin. The question in debate is whether a man can assure his fellow-man of the forgiveness of his sin. Jesus, over against the Pharisees who maintain that God alone can forgive sins, affirms that man has the power to pardon sins. This thought finds expression again in Mt. 18:18, when Jesus enjoins upon his disciples this privilege. Compare Mt. 9:8, where the multitudes glorify God who gives such an ἐξουσία to forgive sins (ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας) to τοῖς ἀνθρώποις "to men"—and not, as it were, to the Messiah. Mk. 2:23-28: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath; so that בֶּר נִשָּׂא i. e., man, is lord even of the sabbath." This at once introduces more cogency into the argument of these five verses, for on this general proposition Jesus is seeking to justify the action of his disciples, not that of himself; the disciples are charged with sabbath-breaking, not he. Mt. 8:19ff., Jesus answers a certain scribe who, apparently unchallenged, expresses his willingness to follow him: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heavens nests, but בֶּר נִשָּׂא i. e., man, hath not where to lay his head." True! man's life is crowded with uncertainty; he knows not where he will lodge the coming night. The beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens are not deprived of home and hearth by their convictions. The antithesis is between man and the beasts. This epigrammatic saying may have been a current proverb and quoted by Jesus in this connection, or he may have coined it on the spot with his own condition of apparent homelessness in mind. Mt. 12:32: "If any one speaks against בֶּר נִשָּׂא i. e., man, that may be pardoned him, but he that speaks against the holy spirit can have no pardon." None of Jesus' auditors could have understood him to say: "You may blaspheme the *Messiah* with impunity, but not the Holy Ghost." The distinction is between the divine spirit objective to and distinct from Jesus and the human instrumentality.

For the purpose of indicating the importance of a knowledge of Aramaic properly to understand the sayings of Jesus reported in our Greek New Testament it is not necessary to follow this phrase any further, or even to take up other sayings of Jesus reported in Greek. We, however, wish to call attention to another fact which will at once strengthen our claim and add still greater convincing force to our argument.

Not only is it true that Jesus spoke Aramaic, and that his sayings reported in the Greek Gospels are translations of the original utterances, but it is constantly becoming more apparent that the Gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—as well as some other parts of the New Testament, were not at first entirely composed in the Greek language. Semitic scholars, philologists, as they approach the present text of the Greek New Testament, are more and more discerning the glimmering rays of the Aramaic original or originals. The statement of a well-known grammarian of the New Testament Greek is certainly of interest here: “a great part of the New Testament writings (the three first Gospels and the first half of Acts) is in all probability a direct working over of Hebrew or Aramaic materials” (BLASS).

The expression Mt. 12:41, 42 (Lk. 11:31, 32) is only to be understood by a retroversion into the Aramaic; ἀναστήσονται (Lk., ἐγερθήσεται) ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ = כרינא עמ (Lk., חקום), and κατακρινούσιν (Lk., κατακρινεῖ) = (Lk., תחיבן). “The men of Nineveh in a lawsuit against this generation shall overcome it, or cause it to be condemned; the queen of Yemen in a lawsuit against this generation shall overcome it, or cause it to be condemned”: i. e., they will show themselves more righteous before God than the Jews, when the respective claims of both sides are matched in a court of justice. In Mt. 23:8 the Greek ought to read ὁ κύριος instead of ὁ διδάσκαλος, רבי (רַבִּי) may indeed signify the latter as well as the former, but here the reference is to God and not to Jesus: “Ye shall not allow yourselves to be addressed either

Lord (רַב) or father (אב), as is customary among the scribes, for one is your lord, one is your father." In the same address to the ecclesiastical leaders of the Jews, recorded in Luke, there is a strange mistake on the part of the Greek translator. The Pharisees, Luke 11:41, are exposed and denounced for their scrupulous zeal for external purifications and then finally challenged: "But give for alms those things which are within!" So the present Greek text, πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα (= τὸ ἐσωθεν of verse 39) δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, is rightly translated in the American Revision. It is, however, difficult to understand without resorting to phantasy, as commentators have done (compare Inter. Crit. in loco), how τὰ ἐνόντα, "the things within," can be the object of δίδοναι ἐλεημοσύνην, "to give alms." Furthermore, in accordance with the preceding antithesis one expects necessarily: but *cleanse* the things within, the inward part. So, indeed, one reads in Mt. 23:26. The Aramaic is the bridge between this yawning and otherwise impassable gulf between "to give alms" and "to cleanse"; in Aramaic both ideas are originally expressed by ܕܢ. \* The Greek translator of the Aramaic original is then responsible for the fanciful interpretations commentators, who give little or no attention to Aramaic, have been led to assign to this passage; and to Semitic philologists is due the credit for bringing here, as in many other instances, order out of chaos, intelligible "Bibel" out of confused "Babel." In Lk. 24:32 there occurs a variant reading which cannot be of Greek, but only of Aramaic origin. A number of MSS. read in this passage: οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, another series offers βεβαρημένη † as a variant of καιομένη.

\* The mistake of the Greek translator more specifically seems to be in this, that he confused the very similar initial letters of ܕܢ, ܕܢ, "to give alms" and ܕܢ, ܕܢ, "to cleanse." This confusion is alone explicable on the Wellhausenian hypothesis of a *written* Aramaic original gospel, in spite of Dalman and Wernle, the latter in *Die synoptische Frage*.

† The Arabic Diatessaron (ed. Ciasca) also has βεβαρημένη: ثَقِيلًا.

This difference is alone explicable when the reading is traced back to the original Aramaic ܕܝܢ and ܕܝܢܐ. ܕܝܢܐ and ܕܝܢܐ. In Luke 4:26 we get a better reading than the present Greek text offers by working our way back to the Aramaic original. "There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only (ܐܝ̈ ܡܗ = ܐܝ̈ܡܐ) to Sarepta, unto a woman that was a widow; and there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian." The expression *γυναῖκα χήραν* is surprising, because it appears only in the second place, and not in the first, where one simply reads *πολλὰι χήραι* and not *πολλὰι γυναῖκες χήραι*. But above all it is clear from the first that the woman was a widow, since according to what precedes only widows are in question; that the woman is a widow can, therefore, in accordance with good style, not be repeated in the most emphatic position in the sentence. On the contrary, one expects the point that she is a non-Israelitic woman, a heathen, emphasized. As it is in the case of Naaman, *ܐܝ̈ ܡܗ ܢܐܝܡܐܢ ܕܫܝܪܐ* and not *ܢܐܝܡܐܢ ܕܠܥܦܪܐܝܬ*, so one expects here *ܐܝ̈ ܡܗ ܡܪܕܝܢ ܕܫܝܪܐ* and not *ܕܫܝܪܐ*.<sup>\*</sup> Now in Aramaic the word for widow is ܡܬܝܬܐ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ, which [palæo]graphically is readily explained as growing out of ܡܬܝܬܐ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ ܫܝܪܐ. It must not be objected that the woman was a Sidonian, and not a Syrian; for ܡܬܝܬܐ, as is well known, signifies commonly *heathen*, and corresponds to the Greek Ἕλλην. In the Syriac Sinai Gospels, Mk. 7:26, a similar change from an original ܡܬܝܬܐ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ (Ἕλληνίς), to ܡܬܝܬܐ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ, has taken place; in our present Greek text it is clear that Ἕλληνίς has reference to the religion, and, indeed, as over against the Sinai Gospel, the Peshito here has another word, ܡܬܝܬܐ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ, pagan; the nationality appears only in *Συροφονικίσσα*.†

\* Compare however LXX. (ed. Swete) on I. Kgs. 17:9: *ἰδοὺ ἐντέταλμαι ἐκεῖ γυναῖκὶ χήρᾳ τοῦ διατρέφειν σε.*

† On the origin or nationality of this woman compare the following

Presumably much that is unclear in the Gospels, or that yields no satisfactory meaning, or no meaning at all, has its origin in an erroneous translation. To detect such errors and correct them is not easy, because of the intangible character of the mental process which has given us the translation. Translations resulting from palaeographical errors are more easily to be corrected. When we pass from erroneous translations, due to a misunderstanding on the part of the translator, to the Aramaisms of a more formal character, such as verbatim or literal translations, the degree of certainty is heightened. Among these more formal Aramaisms are such that can only be accredited to a translator and not to an author who composed in Greek. Thus Mt. 18:15: "If thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault *μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ*." This expression for *face to face, privately*, is Aramaic (ܥܒܪܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ) as well as Arabic, but in Greek unheard of. Mt. 22:36: "which commandment is *μεγάλη* in the law"; a Greek not bound by the letter of the original would have used, yea more,

sources: The Arabic Diatessaron (ed. Ciasca) has: *وتلك المرأة كانت حنيفة من حمص الشام*; MS. B. has: *حنيفة*. According to this reading the woman is "from Homs (i. e., Emesa) of Syria." The translator of *Textus Receptus* has: *جنسها من الصور* "her race from As-Sûr," i. e., Tyre; a gloss adds: *ق فينيقية* "Coptic, Phoenician." The usual Arabic texts of the Gospel (e. g., Erpenius' and De Lagarde's) have: *جنسها من الغفر*, "her race from the Jordan Valley." The Coptic Version [Bohairic] of the New Testament has: *†C2IM1 ΔΕ ΝΕ ΟΥΕΙΝΙΝ ΝΤΕΝ CΥΡΙΑ*, i. e., "a Greek of Syria." The Syriac Sinai Gospel has: *ܡܢ ܥܡܡܬܐ ܕܬܝܪܐ ܕܦܢܝܢܝܐ*, i. e., she is said to be "from the border of Tyre of Phoenicia." The Peshito has: *ܡܢ ܥܡܡܬܐ ܕܬܝܪܐ ܕܦܢܝܢܝܐ*, i. e., according to the Syriac Vulgate the woman is "from Phoenicia of Syria" (= the part of Syria which is called Phoenicia). In Luke 4:27 the Arabic Diatessaron speaks of Naaman, the Nabatean: *الا نعان النباطي*. MSS. A has *النباطي*.

his language would have obliged him to use the comparative or superlative, which is not expressed by a special form in Aramaic. Similar to the foregoing construction are the constructions in Mt. 18:6: *συμφέρει αὐτῷ*, it is more profitable (or most profitable) that a *μύλος οὐκὸς* (ܡܝܠܐ ܐܝܬܐ) should be hanged about his neck; Mt. 26:24: "*καλὸν* were it for that man" = *better*, etc.; Lk. 1:42: "*εὐλογημένη* art thou among women" = *most blessed*, etc. The name of Easter Sunday *μία σαββάτων*, occurring also in the Gospel of John (20:1, 19), can only be explained as a literal translation of the Aramaic, where "sabbath" is also used for "week" (Lk. 18:12), and where in the enumeration of the days of the week the cardinals instead of the ordinals are in use. It is only in the late appendix to Mark, viz., 16:9ff., where the ordinal *πρῶτος* takes the place of the cardinal *εἰς*. The plural form *σάββατα* is most naturally explained as a transliteration of the Aramaic singular *ܣܒܒܬܐ*, *σαββατα*. In Mk. 6:7, 39, 40 the repetition of the same word, with distributive force, is quite striking: he sent forth the twelve *δύο δύο*, he commanded that all should sit down *συνπόσια συνπόσια*, and they sat down *πρασiai πρασιαi*. Excellent Aramaic! but altogether unlike Greek! In Mk. 14:19 *εἰς κατὰ εἰς* seems to go back to ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ. The use of *κατὰ* does not improve the Greek character of the phrase. The oft-recurring *εἰς ἕκαστος* may well be regarded as ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ. Probably *λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος, ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν, ἀπ' ἄκρων ἕως ἄκρων* are also to be placed here. In Lk. 13:9 *κὰν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον—εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἐκκόψῃς αὐτήν* the omission of the first apodosis, *then it is well*, is impossible in Greek; in Aramaic, on the contrary, or even in the Semitic languages in general, it is quite the usual construction. It is difficult to see any meaning in *ἀπὸ μίας* (Lk. 14:18): *καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μίας πάντες παραιτεῖσθαι*, if it is not ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ ܡܝܬܐ, i. e., *at once*. ܐܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ, i. e., *ad unum omnes, oī καθ' ἓνα*, would yield a still more satisfactory meaning, but the feminine *ἀπὸ μίας* does not allow this, nor, on the

other hand, is it warrantable to supply γνώμη. What is the significance of καιρῷ in Lk. 20:10: καὶ καιρῷ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς δούλον, if it is not כּוֹן "at a certain time"? In Mk. 12:1 it is translated by τῷ καιρῷ, i. e., with the article, which in Mt. 21:34 is paraphrased: ὅτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν. The reading in Luke is to be preferred, because it appears to be the most difficult and yet yields the best meaning.

Upon the establishment of the two preceding categories of Aramaisms in the Gospels all other related phenomena, which might otherwise perhaps be attributed to a Semitic author composing in Greek, must be regarded as presenting evidence in proof of translation. Out of the abundance of the material I make a brief selection. Parataxis Lk. 3:19, 20: ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραρρχῆς . . . προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, κατέκλεισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν φυλακῇ. Likewise Mk. 2:23: ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τιλλοῦτες τοὺς στάχυας. In the Aramaic ὁδὸν ποιεῖν after ἤρξαντο, like τιλλοῦτες, was construed as a participle. In the Greek, to be consequent, the construction would require in both instances the participle, or in both cases the infinitive. It is, however, apparent that the idea is not that they by plucking ears made a way! but that they while going plucked the ears of grain. Of a somewhat different character is Mt. 26:15: τί θέλετε μοι δοῦναι καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν, what are ye willing to give me that (καὶ) I may betray him to you? There are also cases of parataxis of subordinate sentences in the subjunctive after a command, e. g., δὸς καθίσωμεν. A relative sentence with the resumption of the relative by means of a demonstrative pronoun we have Mt. 3:12, Lk. 3:17: οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. The periphrasis of the imperfect or of the future by means of ἤμην or ἔσομαι with the participle is also due to a translator who was bound too closely to his Aramaic original. A case in point is: ἦν ἔχων κτήματα πολλά (Mk. 10:22). The imperative also is formed likewise: ἴσθι εὐνοῶν (Mt. 5:25), ἴσθι ὑγιής (Mk. 5:34), ἴσθι ἔχων (Lk. 19:17); com-

pare ἐπάνω γίνου πεντε πόλεων (Lk. 19:19). In the employment of cases and of prepositions Aramaisms are likewise apparent. Ἡ αὐρίον μεριμνήσει ἐαυτῆς, Mt. 6:34 (compare vs. 25); ἐαυτῆς is the Aramaic ܐܢܬܝܐ. Mk. 6:22, ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς Ἡρωδιάδος, the daughter of Herodias, is less Greek than Aramaic; compare ܠܗܝܘܬܐ ܐܘܕܝܬܐ (Sinaitica). In Mt. 23:9 codex D has the correct reading, καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῖν, ye shall not give yourselves the title ܡܬܢ; ὑμῶν is a grammatical correction at the expense of the original meaning. In Mt. 27:22 (Mk. 15:12): τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν, the accusative is only intelligible by a retroversion into the Aramaic ܡܬܢ (ܡܬܢܐ). After the same manner the variant use of εἰς and ἐν (Mt. 6:18, Mk. 1:39, 4:8, 20), without a distinction in meaning, is best explained as a translation of the preposition ܐܢܝܢ. The frequent ἐνώπιον and ἔμπροσθεν is Semitic (ܥܡܢ, ܥܡܢܐ, ܥܡܢܐ), likewise διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, Mk. 6:2. Πέμπειν with διὰ (τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Mt. 11:2), instead of with the accusative, is not Greek, consequently the correction δύο. Nor is it likely that the partitive ἀπὸ in Mk. 6:43 is Greek: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων = part of the fish. The indefinite pronoun is frequently expressed by εἷς; with this construction perhaps is to be classed ἄνθρωπος βασιλεὺς = rex quidam (Mt. 18:23, 22:2), ἔχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος (Mt. 13:28); compare Mt. 13:45: ἄνθρωπος ἔμπορος. The foregoing list might easily be enlarged, but sufficient has been brought forth to show traces of the Aramaic original in our present Greek text.

If then the Gospels were first written in Aramaic and later translated into Greek, the scientific interpreter should always view them primarily from the standpoint of the Aramaic language, and not primarily from the standpoint of the Greek language. To make the translation of any piece of literature the base of its interpretation is always hazardous. We recognize that the English translation of the Bible dare not be made the base of a critical and historical study; likewise ought we

to admit that the Greek translation of the Gospels dare not be made the base of a critical and historical study. The New Testament interpreter whose aim is to get at the original historical meaning will always study any given Gospel passage from the standpoint of the Aramaic language. At random we turn to Mk. 1:4, 5, the subject of baptism. Ὁ βαπτίζων is a substantivized participle (compare Mk. 4:3, Mt. 2:6, 4:3, Lk. 3:14); in Mk. 6:25, 8:28 the substantive ὁ βαπτιστής appears. The passage then reads: "John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins," rather than as in the American Revision: "John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." The Greek passive ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, is in the original language an *intransitive active*. In the West, in Palestine, the word is **צבַע**, rabbinic **טבל**; in the East, in Mesopotamia, **ܥܡܕܐ**, **ܥܡܪ**. The passive construction in Mark, naming the acting subject or agent (ὑπ' αὐτοῦ), is of itself striking (Wellhausen); in Lk. 3:7, in codex D, we read ἐνόπιον αὐτοῦ, instead of ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. In accordance with this the Bezan Latin, as well as the *Evangelium Palatinum*, has: in conspectu eius. Interpreted from the standpoint of the original Aramaic the meaning can only be that John preached the baptism of repentance, *i. e.*, urged it, and that the act of baptism was performed by the candidates themselves, who, in John's presence (ἐνόπιον αὐτοῦ, **ܥܢ ܥܝܢܐ**, **ܒܡܢܬܐ**, **ܒܡܢܬܐ**), on the bank of the Jordan, at his word and in his spirit, plunged into the river and baptized themselves. The candidate for baptism is not immersed by him who baptizes, but he immerses himself.\*

\* I add here the following statement of which I obtained knowledge only some weeks after the above was written: "This uncommon phrase [βαπτισθῆναι ἐνόπιον αὐτοῦ, found in D b e l\* q r] is very likely to be genuine: possibly even it stood in the source from which S. Luke took Lk. 3:10-15. It seems to present a view of Jewish Baptism in which the penitent administered the rite to himself, as Naaman did." *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, edited, collected and arranged by F. Crawford Burkitt, Cambridge, 1904, Vol. 2, Introduction and notes, p. 288 f.

The present Greek text of the Gospels is not the result of the work of the first translator or translators, for it is now acknowledged by those conversant with the facts that the text of the Gospels was for a long time in a marked state of liquidity; the translation has undergone a continuous rhetorical correction. Aramaisms were removed one after the other and an effort was made to produce a purer and more idiomatic Greek. The traces of Aramaisms have, however, not been wholly obliterated. This process of rhetorical correction may, to a certain extent, be traced (a) by noting the variant readings of the Greek MSS., (b) by a careful comparison of the Synoptic Gospels with one another, (c) by a careful and critical comparison of our present Greek text with the versions, some of which present an older and more primitive Gospel text than our Greek New Testament.

We can not pause to support this latter statement by examples, and hence we simply name the most prominent [Semitic] versions. In the first place must be mentioned the Syriac Sinai Gospel, discovered on Mt. Sinai by Mrs. A. S. Lewis in 1892 and edited in 1894. This Syriac Sinai Gospel offers at once an older text than any Greek MS., and is a witness to the New Testament text which dare not be discarded by the textual critic and historical interpreter of the New Testament. Nor dare the student of the New Testament text discard the Curetonian Syriac Gospels, published in 1858 (republished in 1904) and named after their first editor, Cureton. Likewise must account be taken of other Syriac versions, the Peshito, the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum*,\* the *Versio Philoxeniana*. Here, then, are five important helps to a critical study of the New Testament text, but these versions are all in the Syriac language.

\* The linguistic character of the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum* is exhaustively and masterly treated by Th. Nöldeke in Beiträge zur Kenntniss der aramäischen Dialecte: II. Ueber den christlich-palästinischen Dialect in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. XXII. (1868), pp. 443-527.

Another ancient important witness to the New Testament text should be mentioned, Tatian's Diatessaron. This work was apparently at first written in Syriac, and not in Greek. The work, however, has not come down to us in its original form, but only in a late Arabic recension, due to Abulfaraj Abdullah ibn at Tayyib\* († 1043). It was published by its editor, Ciasca, in 1888. This edition is based on the two available MSS., the one of which is in the Vatican, the other in the Museo Borgiano. To make use of this important and now famous work presupposes a knowledge of Arabic.

Another help, though comparatively of secondary importance, should be mentioned, the Ethiopic version of the New Testament, which is related to the older type of text attested by the great Greek MSS., the Vatican and Sinaitic. The version contains also Western and Alexandrian and Syrian elements. No critical edition has yet been published.

These, then, are the main helps at the disposal of the New Testament textual critic who is aiming to get back to the original Gospel tradition in its original language. If it is an important work to get back to the original Gospel tradition, and we believe that it is fundamental, then of course it follows that the scholar working in this department of knowledge should be able to make critical and scientific use of the helps at his disposal. These helps are of such a character that to one who has no knowledge of the Semitic languages they remain sealed. We believe that it is of the greatest importance that every scientific historical interpreter of the New Testament should have a knowledge of Aramaic and Syriac. He who has the most thorough and most extensive knowledge of Aramaic and Syriac, in addition to his knowledge of Greek, is philologically best equipped for this specific task.

In conclusion we sum up. Historical and philological investigation has shown to us that Jesus habitually spoke Aramaic, and not Greek. His sayings reported to us are for

\* A variant reading of the name is at Tabfb. Vide ed. Ciasca.

the most part translated (a few are transliterated) into a language totally different in genius and structure from the language in which they were first uttered; yet the language in which these sayings are reported, as well as the remainder of the Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and half of Acts, bears numerous traces of a Semitic character, probably due to a more or less literal translation. One discerns everywhere beneath the present Greek dress the original Semitic character, in phraseology, vocabulary and syntax. The Semitic voice speaks through the foreign and assumed Greek garb. "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." One who has no knowledge of the Semitic languages, and especially no knowledge of Aramaic, is apt to be deceived, and to pronounce his blessing upon an interpretation which is a perversion of the original historical meaning, because he cannot see and understand the real character of the Gospels before him, clothed in the garb of Esau. Some of the Semitic versions of the Gospels, especially the Sinaitica, are older than the earliest Greek manuscript now known, and are witnesses to a text more primitive and original in important respects than the text of the later Greek MSS. It is evident that a knowledge of the Semitic languages, especially Aramaic and Syriac, is of the utmost importance *to get back to the original Gospel tradition—the text—and to interpret properly the original text after it has been stripped of its foreign garb.*

EASTER, 1906.

## VI.

### THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.

BY PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER NOSS.

The most recent volume of the International Theological Library, from the hands of the late Professor Stevens, of Yale Divinity School, is entitled "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation." It is the first volume of the series to treat a theme belonging to the domain of dogmatics.

The theme is the one which Ritschl well calls "the central doctrine of evangelical Christianity." Lobstein has said: "The proper object and the substance of Protestant dogmatics is the fact of salvation through Jesus Christ; that central truth is the real good in the organism of theological thought, the essential thing, the only necessary thing." Concurring in this view as we do, the title of the new book seemed to us most happily chosen; and our knowledge of the piety and well-proved intellectual power of the author led us to greet its appearance with the most eager interest.

The sad death of Dr. Stevens, on the twenty-second of June last, at the early age of fifty-two, naturally modifies the tone of criticism. Of the book on which he exhausted the last energies of his vigorous mind one would gladly say *nil nisi bonum*. But if he could still speak to us he would no doubt bid us criticize without reserve. The prestige of his name or of the library to which he has made this, his second, significant contribution must not be permitted to hinder the search for truth so conspicuously exemplified in his busy life.

There runs through the book a strong antipathy to what has until recently been the prevailing Protestant doctrine on the atonement. The prospectus of the International Theological Library says that "its aim will be to give full and impartial

statements both of the results of theological science and of the questions which are still at issue in the different departments" so as to form "a series of text-books for students of theology." In this instance the author has not been constrained by the program, and we honor him for it. Dr. Stevens was too sincere a theologian to be satisfied with impartial statements of "results" and "questions." In a matter of historical investigation impartiality may be feasible, but not in that department of theology which has to do with the positive convictions of a representative of the Christendom of to-day. Accordingly we have in this book an aggressive and sustained polemic.

In the opinion of the author there are only two consistent views of the atonement, the "penal" and the "moral." "According to the former, the first work of Christ is to save God himself from inner discord by averting war among his attributes; according to the latter, he came to rescue the sinful sons of men to the Father's house and the Father's fellowship. Between these forever irreconcilable theories, based on radically different conceptions of God, lies the choice." The ruling motive of the book is to convince the reader that the moral view is the only right one and that the other is all wrong.

But there is no use in knocking down a man of straw. In one place the author complains of "a controversial caricature" perpetrated by the opponents of the moral theory, while he himself unconsciously uses the same device. It is always the part of a strategist to get the enemy into an untenable position. The great fallacy of the book lies in the assumption that those who hold that there must be in the character of God as affected by man's sin a real necessity for the sacrifice of Christ are shut up to the theory of "a war among his attributes." If we are not mistaken, the fact that Dr. Strong, of Rochester, was Dr. Stevens' first instructor in theology may have had much to do with his intense prejudice.

According to Dr. Stevens' own exposition, Dr. Strong once made himself responsible for the following unhappy argument: "As we may be kind, but must be righteous; so God, in whose image we are made, may be merciful, but must be holy." Justice is "a principle of God's nature, not only independent of love, but superior to love." "Triumphant holiness, submissive love—are these then, in conflict with each other? Is there duality, instead of harmony, in the nature of God? Ah, there would be, but for one fact—the fact of the cross." In foot-notes to these quotations from Dr. Strong, Dr. Stevens says that this position is not that of the Reformers, but that of the post-Reformation extremists, and he also notes the fact that Dr. Strong in his later writings has propounded a mystical view of the sufferings of Christ which emphasizes his identification with humanity rather than the idea of substitution. Nevertheless, the theory set forth in Dr. Strong's earlier works is for Dr. Stevens the only logical alternative to his own theory, which is: "Christ's whole aim was to induce men to desire and accept pardon. His death created no new fact in God." "The work of Christ is not a mere provision for man's salvation, or a condition precedent, but an actual work of salvation, a real moral recovery of men from sin to goodness." In a new form this is the old issue between Anselm and Abelard; but Dr. Stevens would reduce the Anselmic type of thought to a wretched *caput mortuum*.

It is not our purpose to defend the original Anselmic argument. It is to be regretted that the Heidelberg Catechism reflects so much of that argument as it does. Anselm's confidence that by the exercise of infallible reason the necessity of each step in the whole plan of salvation can be demonstrated *a priori*; the sophistical use of the notion of the infinite, by means of which it is triumphantly shown that the merit won by the sacrifice of the life of the God-man must outweigh the debt incurred by all the offenses of men against the divine majesty, and the distinction made between Christ's active

obedience, which was not optional, and the suffering of death, which was optional—these and other subtleties are not germane to vital faith, and in so far as they are reflected in the Heidelberg Catechism they constitute a distressingly incongruous element in that great confession. Nevertheless, the name of Anselm will always be associated with the view that the sacrifice of Christ affects not only man but also God, or, to use Dr. Stevens' language, creates a new fact in God.

Probably no one in our age will get a clearer view of the significance of the atonement than Rothe. Dr. Stevens' book puts the theories of Rothe and Maurice into the same class with those of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Bushnell and similar thinkers, whose doctrine he thus digests: "God does not need to be reconciled to man; it is man who needs to be reconciled to God." But Rothe is not to be classified so summarily. He was indeed a severe critic, on biblical grounds, too, of the traditional conceptions of the atonement as a juridical transaction, of satisfaction, substitution, imputation and all the apparatus of the theory that our Savior in order to appease the wrath of God personally endured the penalty of the sin of mankind. He says: "The whole notion of 'satisfaction' required by God involves a perversion of thought. For the purpose (*Wille*) to forgive the sinner is present in God from the first and the only question is that of the moral possibility of doing so, of the possibility of doing so in a holy manner, that is, of effecting an expiation for our sin." It could hardly be said more definitely that the atoning work of Christ does primarily affect God, and that it is the indispensable condition precedent to the salvation of men. Rothe explains further that the secret of the hold which the doctrine of satisfaction has had upon the mind of the Church, in spite of its overwhelming difficulties, is to be found in the underlying thought that God can not forgive sin merely on the ground of the penitence of the sinner, but that by an immanent necessity He requires an "objective mediation," by virtue of which the sin must first be made forgivable.

Rothe then shows that the removal of man's guilt on the one hand and the cure of his sinful nature on the other are two interdependent moments in the process of salvation. The consequence of this is the antinomy that God can not abolish the guilt of the sinner so long as he abides in sin, while the sinner cannot break with his sinful past and begin a new life so long as he remains at enmity with God and under His condemnation. The antinomy that Rothe thus states is not a specimen of scholastic subtlety, but is a fact of every-day Christian experience. The sense of guilt has such a paralyzing influence that real moral healing can never begin until by a mighty reaction the soul finds itself a child of God, dead to the past, all things having become new. But before this process has begun, there is in the sinful state of the soul that which fatally obstructs the gracious activity of God toward it. To solve the antinomy there is needed an expiation. Not only does the soul need such expiation; God himself demands it in order that his eternal purpose may be accomplished.

The next step in the argument is to explain how sin can be made forgivable before it is abolished. If God can have a sure guarantee (*sichre Bürgschaft*) that in the case of the sinner his sin will be abolished, provided it be first forgiven, then God may, without compromising His holiness, forgive the sin; nay, He must do so just because He is righteous. Such a guarantee is afforded in the person of Christ. The believer, by virtue of his relation to Christ, is, as Dr. William Rupp has expressed it, a "prospective saint" or "principally holy." In this connection a statement from Dr. Stevens' final summary will bear quoting: "Salvation is primarily salvation from sin, and in salvation from sin salvation from penalty is implicit." It is one of the weaknesses of the penal theory of the Reformers that if the penalty for the sin of mankind has been adequately met, there would seem to be no room left for forgiveness; for when a debt has been paid it is unjust to pretend to forgive it as though it were still due. The

ethical view is, so far as this is concerned, in the right as opposed to the juridical. The primary consideration is deliverance from sin. When the development of sin has been arrested all that is past becomes forgivable. But some one will say that a criminal even when he has repented and reformed is not thereby absolved from the sentence demanded by the law; and if he be a just person he will, for his own satisfaction, insist on paying the penalty. We reply that the Fountain of all justice and Searcher of hearts is not subject to the limitations which determine the mechanical and inelastic form of human justice. "To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses."

To revert once more to Rothe's argument, the problem set before Christ is to "qualify himself to be the Redeemer," the "principle of sanctification." In John 17:19 we read: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." In Hebrews 5:9: "Having been made perfect He became unto all them that obey Him the Author of eternal salvation." This He could accomplish only as He maintained his union with the divine holiness on the one hand and on the other thoroughly identified himself with the human race crushed under the burden of sin, guilt and woe. In order to perfect himself and fit himself to be a complete Savior it behooved Him to devote himself absolutely to God and to men. The degree of self-devotion is the measure of moral perfection. Hence while the whole life of our Lord contributes to the final result, His death, the climax, which marks the absolute character of His devotion, is the cardinal fact without which He could not have been made perfect and without which all else had been of no avail. It may be added that the problem was for our Lord primarily a personal one. True, He did all "for their sakes"; but His moral life was genuine, not merely assumed in order to accomplish an ulterior end. As Rothe says in another place, "there is no one who is not under obligation for his own part

to accomplish the greatest moral task of which he is capable, and this is true even of the Redeemer." Consequently it is not a matter of the acquisition of merit to be set to the account of others, but of the development of a perfect personality in the bosom of humanity, of the second Adam, whose vivific energy since His glorification is the secret of all true salvation.

There is involved in the death of Christ a terror and a struggle inconceivable to our grosser minds; for life and its issues meant more to Him than it can mean to us. There is involved also a conflict with the powers of evil, the nature of which we can only faintly surmise. We know what appeared on the surface—the venomous hatred or the conscienceless contempt manifested toward Him by the most respectable among His countrymen and by the representatives of the great civilization of His age—signs that the evil dominant in the race was somehow focussed upon the meek yet mysteriously potent personality of the Man of Galilee. All this indicates that He was really our representative, our substitute, fighting for us a decisive battle, never to be repeated in human experience. It may also be said that He endured the penalty of our sin, not as a sentence imposed upon Him directly by the justice of God, but by way of a spontaneous reaction between His holy character and the evil in the world. It was the wrath of God against sin that intensified the passions of the men who flouted and slew Him. The fact that such reaction occurred is itself the final condemnation of the whole system of evil in which we are by nature participants.

The view of the atonement thus sketched, following in the main the suggestions of Rothe, may seem to minds inured to the traditional categories, a dangerously attenuated presentation of the Christian faith; but we are convinced that the doctrine must in the future be interpreted after this fashion. This view definitely abandons the incongruities of the theories of Anselm, Calvin and Grotius, which Dr. Stevens so aptly characterizes by means of the expressions "mechanical equiva-

lences, legal fictions and governmental exigencies." It is thoroughly ethicized without undermining the objective religious basis of the Christian life. It combines the strength of the vicarious, the moral and the mystical views. We have outlined it in order to indicate the standpoint from which the book before us is viewed.

Like his master Kaftan, who with Ménégos shares the honors of the dedication, Dr. Stevens divides his discussion into three parts, "biblical, historical and constructive." Ritschl and Rothe divided similarly, but put the history of the doctrine first. Whatever be the order, there ought to be first some indication of the author's attitude toward the whole subject. It is very well to aim to be strictly "inductive"; but it is practically impossible to eliminate all prepossession. It helps one to follow the argument if one can know the general thesis beforehand. At the same time we are aware that it may be good polemics not to divulge the plan of campaign until it can no longer be hid.

In this review we will change the author's order and consider first "the constructive development of the doctrine."

The first chapter under this head very properly treats "the Christian concept of God." The thesis seems to be that the theory of penal satisfaction is built up in defiance of the biblical concept of God. In substance it is an admirable discussion, barring the elaborateness of its protest against the assumption that God may be merciful but must be just. "What should be highest in us is highest in God, namely, love." Modern theologians quite unanimously regard love as the supreme attribute of God. But in resisting the contention that righteousness in the sense of the "unconditional necessity to punish" is the fundamental attribute, it is not at all necessary to obscure the truth that God must be just, not because justice is a power ruling over him, but because He is God. The sentence "God is love" means nothing except as the subject "God" connotes supreme holiness, wisdom and might.

The love of a man is worth nothing to his friend unless it is ruled by "principle," by devotion to the one ideal of righteousness. Much more must God's attitude toward evil be one of abhorrence or wrath. Wrath is but one aspect of love. This is true in two senses. Subjectively, the love of God wears to the sinner the aspect of wrath. "Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun"; but when the eyes are diseased the same light becomes exceedingly hateful. Objectively, it is the love of God that determines his wrath. A man who is a father, when he sees his boy acting unworthily is moved by an intense indignation, which he cannot feel to the same degree when another man's boy does the same thing, because he loves him less. So God said to Israel: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." We emphasize these considerations not because the author entirely ignores them, but because in his polemical zeal he seems unable to give them due prominence.

The second chapter considers "the personality of the Savior." The author opposes the contention that "the saving value of Christ's work for men is dependent upon the truth of any one of the theories of His person which have obtained." It is indeed true that the work of salvation does not wait until men have reasoned out all the implications of their faith. But the most simple Christian faith includes the recognition of the Savior as absolute Lord, and this, at least implicitly, involves a theory of a certain definite type. "Official orthodoxy," he says, "is, after all only the doctrine that won by a majority vote." Nonsense! Often as not the majority was on the wrong side. When councils vote they pronounce judgment on themselves rather than on the doctrine at issue. Not votes, but historical processes account for the supremacy of orthodoxy. As for the rest of the chapter, it is enough to say that while it contains some well-expressed truths, there is not a sentence in it that a Unitarian would not approve. The

point is emphasized that Jesus before He suffered promised inquirers that they should be saved if they would do as He told them. But the principal item in those instructions was "Follow me!" and we know whither He led the way.

In the discussion of "the sin from which Christ saves" it is again the aim of the book to eliminate the unethical elements in the traditional doctrine of sin—an effort to be commended. But theologians will hardly agree to cut the Gordian knot as Dr. Stevens suggests when he says: "It is high time that the problem of the origin of sin should be withdrawn from the field of exegesis and theological speculation and remanded to the realm to which it belongs—the scientific investigation of heredity and of moral evolution." While the problem of original sin has no immediate relation to the Gospel, dogmatics cannot afford to commit its solution entirely to secular scientists. If these should conclude that the ancient Manichean doctrine of the nature of evil comes nearest the truth, could the author accept the verdict? The fact is that his scheme of salvation requires as a background the Pelagian view, and this chapter on sin ought to say so explicitly. If "every man's sin is his own," absolutely and without qualification, what then is left of the problem to be remanded to the scientists? The chapter ignores the fundamental distinction between sin and guilt which rules Kaftan's very helpful treatment of the subject.

The argument of the chapter on punishment may be inferred from the question: "Is it possible that a wise and benevolent God has no concern for the future of sinners, treats them solely with reference to their back debts, and with no purpose or plan for their betterment?" The author does not like the distinction between punishment and chastisement. If his opponents will insist upon the distinction, he is ready to apply his favorite logical weapon: it must be either one or the other; which is it? Accordingly when Dr. Strong says that "punishment is essentially different from chastisement"

he interprets the proposition as equivalent to the assertion that "punishment is essentially non-reformatory and non-deterrent!" He thus delivers a determined charge against the position of the penal theory, confident that when that yields the "quasi-penal" positions will become untenable. We heartily agree with him that "the world is governed neither by law nor by theological definitions, but by a personal God." But it does not conserve ethical interests to obscure the element of just retribution in punishment. Chastisement arbitrarily inflicted never can have any effect on the erring one except to arouse resentment. If it is to effect reform it must be recognized as fully deserved, in accordance with a law which God himself never fails to respect. We are ready, too, to brave the reproach that "the old theology is suspicious of the doctrine of God's fatherhood," and confess that the conception of the fatherhood of God loses its highest significance if His attitude toward man is not profoundly altered when man is saved, so that He may properly be said to have become to him what He was not before.

In regard to forgiveness the limitations of the biblical similes of "payment" and "acquittal" are well emphasized. Such analogies are certainly "too remote from morality and too artificial and anthropomorphic to serve as precise or adequate descriptions of the method of the fatherly love of God in dealing with sinful men." "Forgiveness, then, as a name for the beginning or restoration of right personal relations, denotes the first step, on the divine side, in the development of the saved life. As such it signifies the cessation of God's disfavor and condemnation on account of past sin and His gracious reception of the sinner into His friendship. It alters man's relation to his sinful past since he now knows that having broken with that past, his future life is not to be determined by it, and he is enabled to believe that God now regards and treats him not according to what he has been, or even according to what he is to-day, but according to what

he would like to be." This is excellent. But what the author has said elsewhere constrains us to assume that he thinks of the change from "disfavor" to "friendship" as occurring merely in the imagination of the believer.

The sentiment expressed in the next chapter, that "it is Christ himself and no one single deed or experience, that is the full power of God unto salvation" is worthy of all commendation; but it is generalizing too hastily to assert that theology has for the most part "entirely ignored" St. Paul's conception of the believer's mystical union with Christ.

The author now proceeds to oppose the received doctrine that Christ's death is the ground of forgiveness. That the death of Christ has been emphasized too exclusively in many quarters is very true. But he argues: "To limit the saving work of Christ to His death on the cross would exclude from salvation all men who lived and died before that event, as well as all who, in the centuries that have since elapsed, have not heard of it and acknowledged it as the sole ground of their hope in God's mercy." The undeniable dilemma here suggested confronts any theory that holds that the salvation afforded by Christ is not obtainable from any other source. Just why the penal theory should be more seriously threatened by the dilemma than the moral theory we cannot conjecture. The argument is irrelevant unless the author intended when he framed it to avow a belief that men may be saved by the light of natural religion, or the "essential Christ." In the concluding chapter, which discusses the problems of eschatology in a more logical manner, the author seems to favor the hypothesis of future probation. Here he reproaches the orthodox for having hesitated to accept the hypothesis. He insists that "the only ground of forgiveness is the divine grace," and that such doctrine does not imply an attitude of indifference to sin, but quite the contrary.

How then was Christ's death necessary? "Was His death the direct object of His whole career, or was it an experience

which lay in the path by which He sought some end beyond itself?" To this well-formulated question most of us would reply that while the death was not in itself the end of His mission, it was an inevitable incident in the only course by which the end could be attained. Why? The author in the first place vigorously repudiates the charge of his opponents that the moral theory holds that Christ had to die in order to make an adequate impression upon the minds of men. This is a "preposterous conception." Yet when we look into the author's positive presentation of the purpose of Jesus we find that this was to "magnify and enthrone in the hearts of men the holy requirements of God," "teach men," "show men," "unveil to men," etc. After all this the reader is only mildly surprised by the statement: "His work would not have been a failure if He had died a painless or accidental death."

Under the head of "the satisfaction of God in the work of Christ" we have the thesis: "God is satisfied in revealing His nature and in achieving in His world the ends of His wisdom and holy love." The notion of a satisfaction *ab extra* is absurd, it is argued. The author next emphasizes the idea of "eternal atonement." The historical transaction in the life and death of Christ is but a "specimen." "The word 'atonement' represents a process and not merely a single event." While we agree that there is a profound truth in the ancient doctrine of Patripassianism, that God in Christ is ever grieved by sin and bears the sin that He may save the man, we object to the way in which the issue is stated. The question is not whether the atonement is a process or a transaction, but how the transaction is related to the process. And in the name of all that is "ethical" we object to the disparagement of the merely "transactional." In the development of a human drama a deed at a crisis is in one sense a "specimen" of character, but it is more than that; for it determines all that follows.

The discussions of the remaining themes of justification,

sanctification and the social aspects of salvation are very good. Here, as the author says, "we seem to have emerged at length out of the arena of theological strife into a region of comparative peace." We will not disturb this peace, but turn to the first chapter in the biblical discussion.

At the outstart the author trains his guns on the position that the import of the sacrifices of the Old Testament was "penal or substitutionary." "The original and prevailing idea was probably that of a gift." This original idea, the author maintains, gradually passed through a process of externalization, resulting in the theory of vicarious satisfaction, which he calls a product of "pharisaic scholasticism," "talmudic reflection." The question of fact here it is not for dogmatics to determine. But we may well doubt whether the chronology of an idea has anything to do with its validity. Our critics when they find in the primitive period an idea which does not fit into their own system of thought brush it aside as a crudity, and when the unacceptable idea appears first in a late period, readily dispose of it by calling it the product of a process of degeneration. Not all the ideas of the Jewish theology of our Lord's time were utterly bad, not by any means. Further, while it is no doubt true that the Mosaic law did not regard the sacrificial victim as accursed, since the priests were bidden to eat of it as a holy thing, the sacrifice was substitutionary, nevertheless. The author in one place says: "Whatever may have been the popular interpretation of Jewish sacrifice, neither its original nor its intended and prevailing meaning was penal or substitutionary" (he should have said, "substitutionary in the penal sense"). Later he acknowledges "the gracious substitution of one way of accepting the sinner for another," but insists that "the substitution which was involved in the sacrifices was of the nature of a scenic or symbolic representation." In view of the fact that Christendom does not regard the Jewish sacrifices in any other light than as "scenic" and "symbolic" it is hard to see the point in this last remark.

Under the head of "the prophetic doctrine of salvation" Dr. Stevens makes many true observations, one of which is that the writers of the Old Testament "know nothing of the sharp contrast often drawn by theologians between the righteousness and mercy of God." The point is incontestable. It is just because God is righteous that He is unaffected by the vengeful feelings that obstruct human forgiveness. This accounts for such poetic parallelisms as the following, which might have been added by the author to the quotations adduced:

"Jhvh is righteous in all his ways,  
And gracious in all his works."

"O continue thy loving kindness unto them that know Thee,  
And thy righteousness to the upright in heart."

We are told further: "That He was propitiated by the sacrifices or by any other means in the sense of being rendered merciful or of being thereby made willing to forgive, is a conception which is not only not warranted by any Old Testament statement, but fundamentally opposed to all the presuppositions of Israel's religion." This seems like a wasted shot. Who holds that God must be made "willing to forgive?"

The thesis of the chapter on "the teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels" is: "In treating of our subject theology has built too exclusively upon a few doubtful phrases and has too much neglected the general drift and content of Jesus' teaching regarding the nature and method of salvation." Against the orthodox theology the author brings this charge: "To expect an adequate doctrine of salvation in the teaching of Jesus, it is said, is to look for an unnatural anticipation; it is to require an anachronism. Is this contention intended as an indirect confession that the current theological theories have only a slight or uncertain connection with the teaching of Jesus?" We rather agree with Kaftan that the direct teaching of Jesus taken by itself is in the nature of the case insufficient. The circumstances in which He taught and

the unpreparedness of the disciples imposed a very real limitation. Kaftan says: "Jesus Christ is presented to all subsequent generations only through the declaration of the immediate witnesses of His life and work. And that which gives this declaration special and peculiar significance, apart from the testimony of Jesus concerning Himself which it transmits to us, is the circumstance that the revelation of God in the person of Christ first reached its culmination in His death and resurrection. These facts first brought about a full understanding of His person, mediated the knowledge of His work as a whole and produced the outpouring of the Spirit in the community of disciples. Especially for this reason is the preaching of the first witnesses of the crucified and risen Christ a necessary and indispensable element in the historical revelation of God." If it be granted that Jesus himself was not in a position to interpret His own mission fully, the *argumentum e silentio* ceases to have any significance. In the discussion of particular texts, the author seems right when he contends, after unfruitful study of the hypothetical Aramaic original, that the obvious sense of the expression "His life a ransom for many" is the one intended, namely, that "through giving His life He procured the deliverance of many," there being no allusion to the sacrificial ritual. He is no doubt in the right also when he says that "we cannot ascribe to His death some meaning which isolates it from His life and work in general." The considerations adduced to show why "unto remission of sins" should be excised from Matthew 26:28 (after "this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many") are trifling and beyond the pale of legitimate criticism.

In the chapter on "the Pauline doctrine" the author is very bold. He freely acknowledges that the *ἵλασθαι* in Romans 3:25 can mean nothing else than "a means of rendering favorable" and declares that the position of Ritschl, who explains the "righteousness" which is shown in the sacri-

fice of Christ as signifying God's gracious purpose of salvation, is exegetically untenable. He candidly recognizes the fact that for such passages as Romans 5:8-10 only one interpretation is admissible. We were "enemies" in the passive sense, being objects of God's wrath. The reconciliation must be two-sided. "To Paul's mind there is, in the nature of God, an obstacle to forgiveness which can never be overcome until sin has been virtually punished."

But in the epistles of Paul side by side with this "objective-juridical" theory runs another which the author calls "subjective-mystical." This is the conception of the life of Christ in us which renews us morally and delivers us from the power of sin. This doctrine appears in the Epistle to the Romans, for instance, from the sixth chapter on.

What then will the author do with the doctrine of substitutionary expiation so unequivocally taught by Paul? In the first place he insists that Paul is the originator of the theory. The Gospel which he received, "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" did not involve such a theory; for in the discourses in Acts the death of Christ is not once represented as the ground of forgiveness, as it is by Paul. "Just as he was the first Christian thinker to raise questions as to the relation of Christ's person to the metaphysical nature of God, so was he the first to seek to define the way in which the death of Christ revealed and satisfied the immanent righteousness of God." In the next place he assumes that the theory for which Paul is responsible is incompatible with the ethico-mystical view, and that one must choose between the two. Traditional dogmatics has chosen the former. "The ancient theologies made their discriminations and estimates as really as modern thought ever does. They took what they wanted from the great quarry and left the rest." For himself the author claims the same privilege. Finally he regards the theory which he attributes to Paul as a "survival of

Pharisaism." "It is not only legitimate, but necessary, to distinguish—difficult as it may sometimes be to do so—between the specifically Christian and the characteristically Jewish or rabbinic in Paul." "Here, too, his own word is applicable, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels.' There can be no greater mistake than to confound the treasure with the vehicles of illustration and argument which were supplied by a rabbinic education."

In regard to scriptures and confessions the point has been suggested by Kaftan, by Clarke in his "Use of the Scriptures in Theology," and by others that elements unconsciously appropriated from the environment of the time when the writings were produced are to be distinguished as incidental and non-essential from the positive truths for which, in conscious opposition to strong tendencies in the environment, these writings stand. In this matter our author associates himself with Tennant, who in his brilliant book on "The Fall and Original Sin" assails Paul from another side, saying: "We take the responsibility upon ourselves of endeavoring to discriminate between the thought and knowledge which an apostle derived from the common intellectual surroundings of his time and the essential contents of the Christian revelation of God and morality which he sought to express in terms of it." Here is an important hermeneutic principle, and by no means a new one. But the trouble with some of our modern specialists is that they forget that many of their critical principles are applicable only to comparatively insignificant details. In the very nature of the case the mind of St. Paul, which was not only one of the very greatest minds in the history of the world, but also peculiarly inspired by virtue of his connection with the course of revelation, must have transcended rabbinic limitations in the main current of his thought, whatever may be true of little eddies here and there. And it is worse than begging the question to treat his characteristic doctrines of sin and expiation as incidentals to his

thought; it is preposterous to ask a Christian man so to regard them.

The author completes his study of the biblical data in instructive chapters on the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine doctrine. The limitations of this article compel us to pass by these interesting points.

As to the historical review, acknowledgment must be made of obligation to the author for the service he has rendered in this part of the book. Dr. Stevens was a most diligent reader, apt at summarizing, and he conscientiously endeavored to be fair in his presentation of other men's views.

The epithet "commercial," applied to the theory of Anselm, does not seem just. To distinguish it from the doctrine of the Reformers the term used by Dr. Rupp is better—"meritorious satisfaction" contrasted with "substitutionary punishment."

The great defect of the whole historical section is revealed in the cursory criticism of Somerville's effort to find an "objective element" in the atonement, while guarding against the notion of a "vindictive God," in which connection the author says: "But the idea of a vindictive God who requires to be propitiated, appeased, and so reconciled to us, represents precisely the historical meaning of the objective or Godward bearing of Christ's sufferings and death." Whatever may be true of the particular attempt of Somerville or of the history of the doctrine in general, it is prejudging the case to assume that the extreme and absurd theory represented by Shedd, Strong and Hodge is the only possible construction of the "Godward bearing" of the work of Christ. This unfortunate assumption gives to many of the author's discussions the appearance of special pleading. In his own experience there seems to have been a reaction from one extreme to the other, and the views of men that do not go the whole length are more or less puzzling to him.

We gladly acknowledge our gratitude for the stimulus af-

forded by the perusal of this book—a quality due at once to the author's comprehensive grasp of the biblical data and the most modern literature on the subject, and to the refreshing unconventionality (we almost said naivete) that characterizes his manner of attack. With all its excellences the book is, nevertheless, not quite worthy of its great theme nor of its justly respected and lamented author.

LANCASTER, PA.

## VI.

# CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

### DECLARATIONS ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

From Roman Catholic and Anglican sources there have recently come two declarations on questions of biblical criticism which are interesting and significant. Both of them show that the results attained by the scientific study of the Scriptures are compelling recognition in quarters where departure from traditional conceptions has always been slow and reluctant.

The *first* is the decision, just given to the public, on questions relating to the Pentateuch. It is issued under Papal sanction by the Biblical Commission of the Vatican. Composed as this commission is at the present time of Cardinals Rampolla, Satolli, Segna, Merry del Val and Vives y Tuto—men whose distinguished ability carries commanding confidence throughout the Communion to which they belong—their deliverance is accounted one of the most important ever made by the body to whom questions of this kind are entrusted for careful consideration and authoritative answer. The decision is particularly notable because it shows a marked departure from the unchanged conservatism which hitherto had characterized its findings.

Under five several headings it makes substantially the following well-guarded declarations: (1) The Books of the Bible collectively known as the Pentateuch are correctly attributed to the authorship of Moses. (2) It is not necessary to believe, however, that Moses actually wrote with his own hand, or

dictated to an amanuensis, everything contained in the Pentateuch. (3) Moses is rather to be regarded as having conceived the work under divine inspiration, and to have entrusted the writing of it to other person or persons, and that the work thus formed and approved by Moses, as the principal and inspired author, was made public under his name. (4) It is to be conceded, also, the decision adds, without prejudice to the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch, that Moses used "sources," written documents or oral traditions, from which to suit his spirit and purpose, and that under the influence of divine inspiration, he selected some things and inserted them in his work, thus summarizing or amplifying, as his designs required. (5) Moreover, "due regard being paid to the judgment of the Church," it may be admitted, the decision continues, that in the long course of the ages some modifications have been introduced into the text of these early writings. Among these modifications there may be additions made after the death of Moses, either inserted by an inspired later author, or attached to the text as glosses or interpretations, "concerning which it is lawful to investigate and judge according to the laws of historic criticism." These concessions, it may be granted, do not go very far in the way of recognizing the right and the results of critical investigations in the Bible, but the distance they do go signifies a great deal.

The *second* is a volume\* edited by the Rev. Hubert Handley, M.A., in which the names of seventeen hundred and twenty-five of the clergy of the Anglican communion are given as uniting in a petition which asks for ecclesiastical authority, personally to accept and publicly to declare in their ministry, the properly established results of modern criticism, not only of the Old Testament, but likewise of the New Testament. Their plea is, that however delicate the issues involved, "the Christian faith must not be buttressed by exploded theory or doubtful history." They appreciate, it is

\* "A Declaration on Biblical Criticism," A. & C. Black, London, 2s. net.

evident, that dogmatism regarding the Bible, however ancient, is far more to be feared in its effect upon faith and religion than the results of the movement which insists upon reverent, critical inquiry as to the nature and content of the Sacred Scriptures.

Coming from two of the large and widely influential, historical churches, as they do, these declarations may be taken as indications of the progress that is being made by Christian scholarship in the way of successfully commending the results of its work to increasing numbers of devout men in the churches. Instead of undermining their faith in Jesus Christ, the acceptance of those results removes obstacles to intelligent piety, and deepens devotion to the forwarding of God's kingdom among men. In a new preface to his book† on "Inspiration and the Bible," a new edition of which has just made its appearance, the Rev. R. W. Horton, D.D., finds much satisfaction in being able to note such progress. Twenty years ago when the first edition of the volume was issued, its contentions were savagely assailed and its author denounced as heretical in his teachings. He was not received into the pulpits of certain sister denominations, and even by brethren of his own order regarded an unsafe leader. Now the situation is different. Great changes have taken place. The heresy of yesterday has become the truism of to-day. Doctor Horton is one of the most highly esteemed and widely sought-after ministers in the English metropolis, and his books are given cordial and enthusiastic reception in the churches generally. Is not this change as wholesome as it is reassuring?

SOCIAL SERVICE AN ESSENTIAL DUTY OF THE CHRISTIAN  
CHURCH.

In the opening chapter of his comprehensive and masterly "examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some of the problems of modern social life," a distinguished Amér-

† "Inspiration and the Bible," by Dr. Horton, Unwin, London, 2s. net.

ican writer\* has done several things, any one of which would have been sufficient to place his readers under obligations to him. He has (1) clearly and convincingly shown that among human interests the social question is, at the present time, central and commanding. "No one," he observes, "who lifts his eyes from his own private life can mistake the signs of the times in this regard. Never were so many people, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, philosophers and agitators, men and women, stirred, . . . by the call to social service and by dreams of a better social world. The literature of the present age is saturated with the desire for social amelioration or social revolution, and to pretend that social life is undisturbed, or is but superficially agitated, is simply to confess that one has been caught in an eddy of the age, and does not feel the sweep of its main current." He has (2) traced the history of ameliorative and philanthropic effort, and has characterized certain features of its progress with rare wisdom and insight. Under quiet protest it has accepted existing conditions as irremediable, and sought therefore to mitigate the harder and harsher effect of those conditions, only to find the need of such service constantly enlarging. And he has (3) pointed out the important fact that the present-day temper makes of the social question in our time, something wholly different from the alleviative, economic and social agitations and purposes of the past. "Beneath all the tranquilizing arrangements of philanthropy and industry which are being applied to social disorder," he declares, "there is a vast and rising tide of discontent stirring to its very bottom the stream of social life," and one must be living very remote from the centers of intellectual and industrial life if the truth of this has not been forced on one's notice. The social question now does not concern itself simply with the mitigation of the evils

\* Professor Francis G. Peabody, in his "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," the sub-title to which is above quoted. The Macmillan Company, New York.

of the existing order—it is bent upon dealing with the question whether the order itself has a right to continue. Not social amelioration, but social transformation and reconstruction are the watchwords now engaging attention. Not with conditions and effects, so much as with the causes producing them, is the thought of our time concerned. Instead of inquiring how best to administer charity, the new temper demands the readjustment of the cruel, debasing and iniquitous, social and industrial order, which causes so much of poverty and necessitates corresponding charity. "Not a merciful use of things as they are," says our learned author, "but a state of things where mercy will not be necessary; not patronage, but justice; not the generous distribution of superfluous wealth, but the righteous restitution of wealth to those who have created it—such are the demands to which our ears have of late become accustomed, and which indicate the character of the modern social question."

The situation, as thus stated in the opening pages of a book which has made perhaps the deepest impression upon American readers of any that has been published for a generation in our country, is here referred to with a view of emphasizing the importance of the Church's asking, What attitude ought to be assumed by it toward the social movement of our time? and in connection with the question to notice the answer which, in a practical way, some branches of it are giving to the inquiry.

Since the days of Maurice and Kingsley in England, and of Stöcker a generation later, in Germany, there have been many thoughtful people believing with them, "that the Church must Christianize socialism, or else socialism will shake the very foundations of organized Christianity." In other words, the Church must arouse itself to the recognition and performance of duties which lie beyond its ministry to individuals and to so-called individual salvation. It must see and attend to the requirements made by the social question

of the day or forfeit more and more the hold it ought to have upon the large numbers who are not to be satisfied by a non-committal attitude on its part, nor by blinking the great questions at issue.

Abroad and here at home signs are not wanting that the Church is awakening to the necessities thus confronting it. In Germany, "under principles of Christianity and patriotism, persons of all classes and occupations in the churches, who feel moved by the Christian social spirit," are forming associations for the purpose of considering and attending to these broader claims of society. In England, the "Christian Social Union," which was originated under the leadership of the late Bishop Westcott, and which at this time has Bishop Gore as its president and Canon H. Scott Holland, the noted preacher, as its eloquent promoter, is earnestly at work with the purpose of accomplishing similar aims. Its program is, (1) "publicly and unitedly to claim for the Christian law an ultimate authority to rule social practice; (2) to study how best to apply Christian principles to the solution of the pressing social and economic difficulties of the age; and (3) to present Christ as the living Master and King in practical life, the enemy of wrong and selfishness in every form, and the power of righteousness and love everywhere. In our own country, among the Episcopalians an American branch of this British association has been started, and the ends aimed at are receiving careful attention. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has instituted a similar movement, and assigned the direction and development of the purpose to a competent superintendent. If the plan of federating the various Christian churches according to the suggestions of the Inter-Church Conference of last year, will be consummated, work along these lines of social service would no doubt constitute one of the most important and useful departments to challenge serious thought and coöperative effort.

A late issue of the *Churchman* observes that the message of

such social activity "is the message of the Incarnation. Because the Son of God has come in touch with human life, every part of that life has been sanctified by His entrance into it. For His followers, therefore, religion must mean the bringing of God into every work they have to do, or rather the lifting up of every work into the life of God." This agrees with what Dean Hodges has been insisting on with such powerful and repeated urgency in the several books\* which have done so much in the way of stimulating and guiding current thought on this subject. "Christianity must get a grip on all life if its designs are to be met; it is not worth having unless it makes us better men and women in every-day affairs, more honest and upright in business, more just and honorable in our social relations, more fair to others if we are employers, more faithful if we are of the employed. The religion which does this six days of the week is just six times as valuable as the religion which allows us to do what we will on those days, and then tries to help us serve God on Sunday!"

The effort to promote social service according to such conceptions ought readily to command general approval among those that profess and call themselves Christians, and if this is what Christian socialism stands for and endeavors to accomplish, the ill odor which for many the word "socialism" has would speedily be lost. It is not a spurious liberalism, not an extravagant and rapacious antagonism to ecclesiastical institutions, not an atheistic tendency under whose banner revolutionary extremists are working to overthrow existing social conditions—it is rather a distinct religious effort to bring all life, individual and social, industrial and national, under the sway of law according to the mind of Christ. And instead of deserving our reprobation, or to be looked upon with suspicion, ought it not to command our support, and does

\* The titles of the books referred to are: "Christianity Between Sundays," "The Heresy of Cain," "Faith and Social Service" and "In this Present World." They are published by Thomas Whittaker, New York.

it not justify itself to our regard by what it attempts and is accomplishing? In England, for example, the Social Union of which we have spoken, has now for some time been in the very forefront of every movement for social betterment. It has worked for and secured, to an extent that would not have been possible under individual effort, changes in work-shop and factory laws, improvements in housing conditions for the poor, sympathetic assistance to the down-trodden, the degenerate and the unemployed, restrictions in the employment of women and children, and provisions in the way of healthier sanitary and moral surroundings for all classes of working people. By sermons, by lectures, by newspaper articles, by pamphlets, this organization, meanwhile, is scattering information, building up public opinion, enlightening and strengthening the individual and public conscience—all of which must aid in effecting other important and necessary changes in the unhallowed conditions now obtaining. Is not work along corresponding lines loudly called for in our land, in every one of the great centers of population? Conscious of this, what should the Church do in the way of organized, coöperative and sympathetic effort to bring about the needed change? There can be no room for doubt as to the proper answer. Not only should individual interests be enlisted in the furtherance and support of such social effort—entire church organizations as such should, by concerted action, lend a helping hand to this “central and commanding” cause of the age.

#### A LEADER OF THOUGHT IN MATTERS OF FAITH GONE.

On the twenty-second of last June Dr. George B. Stevens, Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale Divinity School, died at the age of fifty-two years. In his death, not only the institution with which he was connected but American scholarship in general has sustained a great loss. After being graduated from Rochester University and Yale Divinity School in 1877 and 1880, respectively, he filled brief pastor-

ates in Buffalo and Watertown, New York. Subsequently he studied in Germany, and received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Jena. Since 1885 he was a member of the faculty of the school in whose service he continued to the end of his life, during the earlier years as professor of New Testament criticism and interpretation, and after the death of Dr. Samuel Harris, as the latter's successor, in the principal chair of the institution.

The promise of his brilliant academic career was well sustained during the years of his professorial service. His distinguished ability as a trustworthy guide in appraising the value of the critical and speculative conclusions of others, probably as much as that which is shown in the original product of his own study and investigation, has long been recognized and gratefully acknowledged by contemporary scholars. In both directions his ability made him an authority among present-day thinkers, and the passing of comparatively few leaders among us would have occasioned more general regret or more genuine sorrow. With keen and penetrating intellectual powers and a fine balance of discriminating judgment, he united a remarkably simple and winsome personality. By nature and attainments he was qualified to bind to himself in strong esteem and sincere affection not only the students whom he taught and the ministry of the church of his order, but hosts of others who had the pleasure of personal acquaintance with him, or knew him only through his contributions to theological literature. Through his class-room lectures, his sermons and his writings he wielded an influence of great importance to the religious thought of our age and country, and several features characteristic of his theological work may perhaps be profitably referred to, in connection with this memorial note.

1. Doctor Stevens grounded his system of religious thought and theological science on broad, catholic principles. That explains why for him the differences of schools counted so

much less than the great accords of universal faith, and, also, why from a denominational school he could speak with such favor and acceptability to men of all churches. The broad foundations on which he built his utterances, written and oral, helped him to avoid without conscious design controversial aspects of the truth; or better, perhaps, he silenced controversy by emphasizing fundamental truths in a way that made them, in his setting, of real service in meeting the intellectual and practical needs of Christian people of every name. He was not a dogmatician. In the spirit of a "sweet reasonableness" he assumed the substance of Christian doctrine to be true in a broad and undisputed sense, and left to others the divisive work of definition, criticism and exegesis in the interests of particular theories and dogmas. His solid sense, his open-minded faith, his frank efforts to use new light in placing the teachings of Christ in right and reasonable relations with the accepted realities of life and experience—these facts gave weight to his words and made them generally welcome and helpful.

2. In the mind of Professor Stevens, the value of all religious and theological knowledge must be estimated according to the significance it has for the supreme end of life—character. Possibly the most self-revealing piece of work performed by him is the book\* which he published at the time of his accession to the Dwight professorship at New Haven. The first chapter of that excellent little treatise is devoted to an illuminating discussion of the relation of doctrine to life, and may be taken as a declaration of the principles by which he proposed being guided in his search after the truth for himself, and, in the impartation of it to others.

"It will be seen," he says, "that theology and religion are related to each other as theory to fact or reality. It involves

\* "*Doctrine and Life*"—a study of some of the principal truths of the Christian Religion in their relation to Christian experience. By Geo. B. Stevens, Ph.D., D.D. Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, 1895.

no disparagement of theology to say that it is theory. In all human life theory and practice are inseparably conjoined, and react powerfully on each other. That a vicious theory may be harmful is evident, since it may suggest or involve motives and methods of action. All theory is a product of thought, and thought is most closely related to conduct. There may, indeed, be theories which are so remote from all human interests as to involve no practical consequences; but this cannot be said of those which concern the more essential truths of religion. Moreover, the view so commonly advanced, that a certain theory may be inherently right, but the opposite of it justified in practice, is a sophism which no sound philosophy can support. It is important to adopt in theology and morals the soundest and most adequate theories which are attainable. In our time indifference to doctrine seems to be thought by many to be the mark of supreme devotion to truth. But indifference to doctrine is indifference to thought on the themes of religion, and religious thought can never be wisely disparaged in the supposed interests of religious life. I grant that it is important to recognize the limits beyond which we cannot go in our efforts to describe the nature and action of God and the mysteries of our own being. But these limitations do not preclude all thought about these realities. If we know *anything* about them, we must have theology. If we know *nothing* about them, how can we have even religion?"

Although written more than ten years ago, these words have lost none of their timeliness and force in contending for the need and worthy practical purpose of Christian doctrine in an orderly and systematized form. All around us there are still many, even would-be religious teachers, who do not hesitate to pour contempt on theology. Often in ill-considered language such ones may be heard to disparage not simply the ancient systems of doctrinal truth, but those of more recent date whose statements are more rational and a closer approximation to a thoroughly defensible and satisfying ideal. There

is solid usefulness in having a knowledge of Christian truth in carefully worded and closely articulated statements, not—as the opponents of theology just referred to seem mistakenly to suppose—for the purpose of formulating a logically constructed system of doctrine by which to test intellectual orthodoxy, but rather for the purpose of having a sound, rational basis to support the highest form of moral and religious life, and to inspire the noblest Christian character. The contentions of our lamented author along these lines met with approbation in many of the historic churches, and it is to be hoped they may be destined to effect needed changes of opinion among those who as yet are not persuaded that it is a knowledge of the truth that conditions personal freedom, which is only a description of loftiest character.

3. According to Doctor Stevens' view, we are to believe the needed system of Christian doctrine to be an ideal as yet only imperfectly realized, but capable of being realized with increasing fulness through the accumulating results which devout students, guided by the Spirit, are achieving. In other phrase, he inculcated confidence in the living growth of Christian thought. He was, in his own life as a student, a progressive theologian. He could not rest satisfied with the traditional theologies of the early Fathers, nor with those of the sixteenth century. The *forms* in which truth was stated in other ages and circumstances failed to command his acceptance and approval. He was not disposed to close his eyes to the new light brought by modern scientific and historic investigations. He was not willing to justify a theology of nescience and indifference, nor would he stifle the demands which his rational nature made upon him. He was responsive to the suggestions of men like Schleiermacher and Coleridge, Maurice and Robertson, Tholuck and Dorner, in one realm of thought, to those of W. Robertson Smith and Cheyne, Ritschl and Harnack, Darwin and Drummond, in other realms. This general observation is not intended to convey the impression

that he was ready to follow these men the full lengths to which they went in their thinking, but that he recognized them as earnest searchers after the truth and worthy therefore of receiving a sympathetic hearing. It means that under their leadership he felt it necessary to modify the older theological formulas and doctrinal interpretations—his method in doing this being evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Without repudiating the truths imperfectly stated in the historic confessions of the Church, he insisted those confessions had been outgrown, and ought, therefore, to be displaced by others framed after the best established results of recent scholarship.

The freedom which he claimed for himself in this regard he cheerfully accorded to others also. Divergence in doctrinal conceptions, in his judgment, was a sign of vitality to be regarded with satisfaction, rather than as a valid reason for looking with suspicion upon a fellow Christian, or for refusing to fellowship in Christian effort and activity with denominations thus separated. In this matter Professor Stevens certainly represented and fostered a catholicity of spirit which is one of the most admirable that at present is characterizing the Church, and which owes its existence and growth very largely to the broad-minded and courageous leadership of men like him. Whenever discovered by men, that spirit appeals to them, and in the case of the lamented author and teacher of whom we are now writing it accounts in a large measure for the wide influence he wielded and for the warm affection with which so many esteemed him.

The doctrinal modifications, above alluded to, which grew out of his spirit and method as a Christian theologian, are on record in the books with which he has enriched the religious and theological literature of our age. Into the particulars of these modifications it is not the purpose of these notes to make inquiry. That must be left for individuals to do for themselves by taking up and studying his books. In addition

to the volume already mentioned, there are three\* others which by many are regarded as permanently important and significant for religion and theology. The suggestions he made are generally so sane as to insure for them cordial and grateful welcome, and the conclusions reached are always so reasonable and self-authenticating, that it may be confidently affirmed they will not soon be superseded. Thinking men interested in the great questions with which these books deal, may well feel themselves largely and lastingly indebted to him for the service he has rendered. If the service is that of one who reflects the light of German thought and scholarship, as much as it discloses that of original research and philosophical speculation, it must, nevertheless, be acknowledged to point the way with extraordinary distinctness to a more rational method of dealing with the great mysteries of our faith, and for the application of doctrinal truths to the individual and social problems of the day. It may be granted that in some respects he does not rank with certain earlier theologians of our country whose names are familiar in the churches, but from a practical viewpoint his theological and biblical labors met the peculiar needs of the age with a skill and to an extent that, it is more than probable, he will be remembered when the more original and speculative theologians are forgotten.

BALTIMORE, MD.

\* "The Pauline Theology," 1892; "The Theology of the New Testament," 1899; and "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation," 1905. Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y.

## VIII.

### CHRISTIAN UNITY IN THE REFORMED CHURCH —AN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

BY REV. CONRAD CLEVER, D.D.

When the Titans of human history press forward to blaze the trees as guideposts for the paths along which subsequent centuries must go, they are not always as sensitive to the amenities of life as might be expected. They mock the well-fed prophets of Baal with a sarcasm that stings to the quick of the whole personality. Clad in their camels'-hair garments, and eking out, without complaint, their existence upon locusts and wild honey, they call for repentance and judgment while they hear the footsteps of the coming King. Kings feel the weight of their fiery tongues, and adulterers cower before them, chattering with remorse if not repentance. They do not feast in king's houses nor wear gay clothing. It ought not surprise us if even the gentler requirements of the Man of Gallilee are forgotten by men like these. They see the gleaming ax lying at the root of the national tree, and with excited fury rail out against every form of wickedness. They are iconoclasts and are not always able to discern the sweeter notes of that charity that is twice blessed, blessing him that gives and him that receives. With the ruthlessness of the reaper that cuts down with the grass and clover, the nest in which so much untutored melody sleeps, these sweep away with the refuge of lives, much that in calmer moments would have been spared. At times like this when the spirit of the forerunner revels riotously, it is a matter of rejoicing when one stands up boldly with the sweet reasonableness of Jesus.

The actors in the great Reformation drama, which so frequently was tragic, were pioneers. The King's business re-

quired that unmerciful blows be given the enemies of advancing civilization. Those who could deal such strokes could not come forth, debilitated by social excesses. While all this is true the harmlessness of the dove should be joined with the wisdom of the serpent. There was one voice in that clash of arms that seldom, if ever, forgot the admonitions of the Gospel. There was much in his temperament and training that prompted him to exercise this spirit. But it should be noted that his very first effort at practical reform came after a careful study and exposition of the Gospels. From these he felt that he could pluck the flowers from the Paradise of God, that he might scatter upon the pathway of those who were weary with the conflict of sin. Ulric Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer and Founder of the Reformed Church, was always intensely sensitive to anything that would unnecessarily rend the seamless robe of Christ. Melancthon had much of the same spirit, but without that independence of character, which enabled him to break away from the iron grip of the great Saxon Reformer. After this was loosed by the hand of death and the leaven of Zwingli's influence had made itself felt, he too recognized the sin of schism. But in the early days of the Reformation, when the individualism and liberty of Protestantism wasted themselves in riotous extravagance, Zwingli, almost alone, sought for peace and union. It was this spirit that prompted him to give such a welcome to Carlstadt, when he had fallen into disfavor with the Wittenberg theologians. At first he in a mild way defended Carlstadt, and his confreres, though later he was forced to take a stand against him. Even then when the council of Zurich, on account of the dangerous tendencies of his political teachings, which seemed to threaten the stability of the government, had cast some of the leaders into prison, Zwingli objected to the decree, and plead for such disputations as might bring them to see their errors, and to come back into the fold.

This brotherly kindness shown to one whom Luther hated

as generously as he did popery led to strained relations between Zurich and Wittenberg. Charges and counter-charges were made with reckless disregard of the peace and quietness of the Church. Men's hearts were failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that were coming upon the earth. To many it seemed to be good to be casting about for some way by which they might get back into the old fold with the least possible sacrifice of self-respect. To others there was a heart-sickness that there should be such an unseemly strife among the brethren. Luther, a past master in vituperation, when his anger was stirred, assigned Zwingli and his followers to a place outside the pale of mercy. It was when this spectacle of sinful conflict became unendurable that the magnanimous Prince Philip of Hesse sought to bring the contestants together to a disputation. The place selected could only be attended by the Swiss theologians at great personal sacrifice and danger. Besides they were entering upon the encounter in the midst of surroundings that would be much more sympathetic to Luther and his followers, than to Zwingli. There it would be possible to gather a crowd of such formidable proportions of the former's adherents that they could stampede the meetings if judgment should go against them. None of these things moved Zwingli, consumed as he was by a passion for union. He even disregarded the decree of the Council of Zurich forbidding him to go beyond the borders of Switzerland, and agreed to appear at the conference. In the face of direct warnings from his anxious friends and horrible dreams which haunted him, he set out upon his journey armed with nothing but a burning desire to glorify God and save the Reformation from unseemly division. Before going to Marburg he had already manifested a desire for peace. He had sought for such a league of concord as would have bound all Europe together for advancing the interests of the kingdom. In this he wished to provide for the fullest freedom of the individual while uniting them together, "by the spiritual

bond of a common faith; of a common *submission to the Gospel*, embraced with a pure mind and carried out in practice; satisfying the understanding and contenting the heart; one in *its aim* of worshiping God; diverse in *its mode* according to the usage and wants of the country, tolerating philosophical as little as dogmatical dictators; repudiating alike the propaganda and Jesuits; a league whose members are not exclusive like Jews, but helpful like Christians." The nineteenth century has seen something of the realization of this splendid dream of the Reformer at Zurich.

This article does not require a complete and detailed history of the Marburg Conference. To a great extent it was an egregious failure. But with such a background of failure the clean-cut figure of Zwingli as a man of peace appears in Alpine proportions. He seconded the efforts of Philip, and rallied all the Swiss Reformers to strenuous efforts in order to win the Wittenbergers. The spirit of Luther was shown in a letter written but a short time before the conference. "For myself I confess that I do not think Zwingli a Christian with all his doctrines for he holds and teaches no part of the Christian faith rightly, and has become seven times worse than when he was a Papist, according to Christ's judgment: 'The last state of that man shall be worse than the first.' I make such a confession that I may be without blame before God and the world, because I have no share in Zwingli's doctrine nor will have to all eternity." There were times when he seemed to have become incapable of confining his expressions within the bounds of reason. He alarmed his friends even when he said with an insane stare: "Cursed be concord; down with it to the bottomless pit." Even Melancthon seems to have fallen under this power of disunion until his usually sweet spirit deserted him. He wrote to a friend: "Rather would I die than live to see this Zwinglian affair polluting our just cause." The Wittenbergers only yielded to the well-meant efforts of Philip after considerable pressure asserting that these would

be entirely in vain unless the Swiss would yield—a specimen of being open to conviction but really desiring to see the person that could convict. In contrast to all this, but with the spirit of Jesus dying on the cross, or the first martyr bowing beneath the crushing stones, Zwingli went to meet Luther.

The arguments were learned and at times heated. The time was filled up by the Prince urging agreement. But when Luther said that even a partial agreement was impossible unless our opponents accept our views every one perceived that the conference would be of no effect. When it became evident that the meeting was in great danger of ending in complete failure, Zwingli's heart sank within him. Faintness got such hold upon him that he felt something like the cold chill of death stealing over him. While Philip was urging upon the Lutherans concession, Zwingli sat apart from his friends and shed tears in silence. At the final meeting in the Ducal Palace when the Landgrave had ceased any further importunity, Zwingli came forward and said: "Let us confess to the world the points in which we agree and as for the rest let us treat each other as brethren." This expression of charity and brotherly love stirred the heart of Philip again and he besought the Lutherans to comply. Zwingli, his eyes swimming in tears, feeling that the crucial moment had come, approached Luther, holding out his brotherly hand. It is one of the supreme moments of the reformation time, if not of Protestant Christianity. Some of the spectators of this great scene realized with profoundest emotions the significance of the occasion, and watched with a death-like stillness for the denouement of the whole conference. Luther failed. The proffered hand of love was rejected. The olive branch of peace was trampled under foot, as an unholy thing. In the spirit of prophecy he said: "You have a different spirit from ours." Thinking that possibly he had acted in an unchristian manner, he held a hurried consultation with his fellow theologians and added, before the rest of the company had recov-

ered from the wreck of their fond hope: "You do not belong to the communion of the Christian Church; we cannot acknowledge you as Christian brethren." So said in spirit Melanchthon, Brenz, Justus Jonas and the rest. The spirit manifested by Zwingli on that memorable occasion became engrained in the life of the Reformed Church, and has distinguished it on every occasion where the subject of Christian unity has been concerned.

After the first heat of passion had somewhat subsided, the Prince begged them to draw up an expression of those truths on which all were agreed. The preparation of this document was committed to the good offices of Luther. At last he appeared with a document containing fifteen articles, to fourteen of these all were ready to affix their signatures without any compromise of the truth. There remained the necessity for some expression in regard to the Lord's Supper. This Luther drew up in language which seemed to him contrary at every point to his ideas of the Swiss doctrine of the eucharist. To his surprise, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer and Casper Hedio signed it without any controversy. It remained for Calvin to formulate the doctrine of the Reformed Church as to the Lord's Supper. As it is said, without a Stephen no Paul, so we feel safe in saying that without a Zwingli no Calvin. Zwingli's view of this ordinance has not always been set forth by historians of the Reformation in its proper light. In the article signed at Marburg, he admitted that "the sacrament of the altar is the sacrament of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ."

The influence of Zwingli for Christian unity was felt in all the borders of the Protestant Church. There sprang up a line of theologians who sought not only for a union of the different branches of Protestantism, but also of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Church. When Cranmer formulated the doctrines of the English Church and prepared her liturgy which has been her glory, he was surrounded by eminent for-

eign theologians who owed their spirit to Zwingli. Some of these had fled from the disturbed conditions on the continent, and some had come in response to the invitation of the great Archbishop. A'Lasco, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, Ochino and Tremelius were some of the most distinguished. In June, 1548, when the spirit of unity reached high-water mark in the Church of England, the Archbishop of Hardenberg wrote: "We desire to set before our churches the true theology, and we have decided that we need the presence of learned men, to compare their decisions with ours, so as to do away with doctrinal controversies, and build up a whole body of true doctrine. We have summoned a great many of godly and learned men, some of whom we have already got and expect others soon." Cranmer himself wrote to Calvin: "With your power of observation you cannot but see how much the Church of God is weakened by dissensions and differences of opinion regarding this sacrament of unity. I am anxious about this subject itself, also about the very words and forms of expression." The spirit of Zwingli still goes marching on, and the one end of that golden thread of Christian unity, which runs like a gleam of heavenly sunshine through every page and movement of Reformation history, is held in the charitable hand of Zwingli. None tried harder to show to the world that the disciples of Christ marshalled under the Reformation banner must be one if they were to show that the world ought to believe that the Father had sent the Son for its salvation.

In the course of Reformed Church history another golden glow flashed out upon the turbulent waters. Another Reformed character of heroic proportions filled with the spirit of Christian unity appears providentially in the nick of time. If in the earlier period the Protestant Church had been chastised with whips, it is now being chastised with scorpions. The Palatinate, presided over by a prince of decided pacific intentions becomes a dumping ground for some of the most

turbulent spirits of that turbulent century. Heidelberg becomes a storm center, since all forms of Protestantism were tolerated with the hope that out of such a course would grow a spirit of patience and sympathy, as might produce such a unity as was longed for by some of the most elect spirits. This idea, however, was soon exploded. The Roman Catholic prophecy that Protestantism was anarchistic, and must end in failure on account of a lack of that adhesiveness necessary to endure the change of dynasties, and the advance of new ideas of civilization seemed about to be fulfilled. The different elements of Protestantism were even stiffer in their opposition to each other than at Marburg. As the divisions increased in number the jealousy grew in rancor. The green-eyed monster had become so ravenous that its motto was "rule or ruin." The scandal reached intolerable proportions, when Hesshus leaped within the chancel rails while Deacon Klebitz was celebrating the Holy Communion, snatched the elements from his hand, and dashed them upon the floor. This proved to Frederick the Third, what had long since been evident to many deeply interested in the welfare of the kingdom, that tolerance to such untamed spirits ceased to be a virtue. Lutherans, Zwinglians and Calvinists had each other by the throats, and had begun a conflict even unto death. The annihilation of one party by the other was much more desirable than a victory over the Roman Catholic Church. It was not to be thought of, for a moment, that one party should become the recognized form of religion in the Palatinate, even though the other should be tolerated.

The spirit of Zwingli had won Melancthon from the stiff Lutheran position assumed at Marburg. Calvin had become so imbued with the spirit of unity that he assured Cranmer that he would willingly cross ten seas to bring it about. The Swiss theologians had industriously disseminated the doctrines, and remained loyal to the special unionistic teachings of Zwingli. Christian unity was in the air and the feeling

of its necessity had become increasingly intensive ever since the giants had stood face to face, and separated without the kiss of peace or the handshake of an abounding charity.

Frederick was one of the purest, noblest and most pacific princes of that period. When the time came to stand for the truth he was as grand as Luther before the Diet of Worms. When courage and conviction were needed to deal with a condition which threatened to sweep from the stage both Church and State under their Protestant forms, he became a man of iron. When wisdom called from the opening of the gates and from the chief places of concourse in the city he answered with all the humility of Hannah's young son: "Speak Lord for thy servant heareth." He took counsel of all of the Reformation pillars of all phases of evangelical belief. He sought out men of discretion and charity. He felt that there was truth in all these different phases of Church life, but that personal vanity and selfishness had blinded many of the best men, so that one supreme commanding motive of all should be to get hold of columnar truths which had foundation in the word of God, and keep as close to these as possible. The safety of doctrinal expression demanded that it be set forth in terms as nearly scriptural as possible. Before any of the Reformation defenders of the faith, Zwingli had discerned the place of the Scriptures in theological definition. In the first Helvetic Confession (1536) he declared that: "The Canonical, the Word of God, given by the Holy Ghost, and set forth to the world by the Prophets and Apostles, the most perfect and ancient of all philosophy, alone contains perfectly all piety and the whole rule of life." Following Zwingli's ideas Calvin gave such impetus to them that the "supreme authority of Scripture was set forth in all the symbolical books of the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, France, England, The Netherlands, Scotland, etc." I need scarcely remark in passing how closely the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism followed the inspiration of Zwingli, and the counsel so care-

fully given them by Frederick the Third in defining and expressing the doctrines of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The commission given to the men chosen by Frederick at the suggestion of Melancthon and Calvin and other great Reformers showed the catholic spirit of the Prince. "Their commission was to form a catechism that should suit the wants of the Palatinate. It must represent the Reformed faith, and yet be true at the same time to the general spirit of the Augsburg confession. The catechism must be such a system, as Melancthon, if living, might join with Calvin to subscribe in testimony of their common faith."

Without giving a hook upon which the higher critics may hang some of their misfits, it has been said that the authors of the catechism, Zacharias Ursinus and Casper Olevianus were inspired. The Reformed Church occupied a mediating position between Calvinism and Lutheranism. The crystallization of this thought in catechetical formula was accomplished by the chosen instruments of Frederick the Third.

It was sent forth to be an olive branch of peace. The extremists viewed it as a child of darkness and would have prevented its use if possible. It is to be congratulated on the enemies it has made. It enjoyed a hearty reception. Soul-weary and tired with the dissensions of Protestantism, it was hailed by the people as a rallying point for Protestantism. It is stated that next to the Bible, the "Imitation of Christ" and Bunyan's immortal allegory, it has been translated into more foreign languages than any book ever originating from the human heart and brain.

It is not too much to assert that there is not a brighter page in the history of Christian unity than the conception, preparation and publishing of the Heidelberg Catechism. Men are weary with the unnecessary divisions of Christ's Church. They are beginning to feel restless at the everlasting demands for trying to make a distinction where there is no difference. They have not reached that point where they are looking for

a common platform on which they may unite. When that time comes, as come it must, when the desire for union must be satisfied, the Reformed Church will present the *Magna Charta*. Barring the unfortunate appendix to the eightieth question, the Roman Catholic Church might so trim its traditions and brush away its medieval barnacles as to accept it as a formula of fundamental truth, upon which it could unite with the Protestant Church. The Reformed Church standing upon the Heidelberg Catechism, and interpreting it historically, must encourage every effort after Christian unity. This has oftentimes proved a weakness because of the lack of that millennial sunshine that will melt some of the icicles frozen upon the Church in these winters of dogmatic idolatry.

Maintaining, as we have done, that there is an organic relation between the efforts for peace made by Zwingli at Marburg subsequent movements towards unity it should find expression in the subsequent history of the Reformed Church. There was a conference held at Cassel A. D. 1661, at which time some Marburg Reformed theologians enlisted the sympathy of some Lutherans of the Calixtus type, to promote a union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. Owing to the violent Synergistic controversy raging at that same moment it failed to command the attention which it deserved.

With the dawn of the eighteenth century the Brandenburg dynasty made unwearied efforts to bring into close fellowship the Reformed and Lutheran communions. To the Reformed court preacher was committed the task of bringing together representatives of the different ecclesiastical organizations. For some reason these worthy efforts of the Reformed people were not heartily seconded and thus became simply way-marks showing the course of the Reformed Church in this matter. They show that it has ever remained loyal to impressions woven into its genius and character as a representative of that unionistic spirit which will ever assert itself till we all come into the unity of the spirit, and unto the measure of the fullness of the stature of men in Christ Jesus.

Whether the union, accomplished by Frederick the Third in 1817, has justified the welcome with which the movement was first hailed or not, one thing is certain, it could never have been effected without the aid of the unionistic spirit in the Reformed Church. The opposition to it which in a measure militated against it arose from the opposite party. The Reformed Church, true to its genius for union, was willing to be swallowed up by the Lutherans, only so that another gaping wound might be healed. This article would not be complete without proving by a shining example that the same coals are still on the altar waiting to be fanned into a lambent flame. When the Reformed Church in America in 1771 severed their connection with the Classis of Amsterdam, the descendants of the Palatines protested against it. Much to their disgust the separation came and they refused to be a party to the division. A continuance of the relation on account of linguistic difficulty, and the lack of a mutual understanding continued until 1793, when the Reformed Church in the United States separated from the mother Church in Holland and established the Synod. Though separated, our branch of the Reformed Church has been diligent in seeking for a renewal of organic relationship with the whole Reformed family of churches. In 1891 there was a strenuous effort made to establish a governing body which should have synodical authority, and thus keep the two Reformed Churches in organic fellowship. Our portion of the Reformed Church shows to good advantage in this effort at reunion. Though in round numbers twice as large in membership and ministry, we were willing to come in on equal representation. This is an invincible proof that the living spirit of Zwingli and of our Fritz still abides in the communion that acknowledges them next to Jesus Christ as leaders.

When other great communions are looking for inspiration to move forward with what seems an impossible though greatly desired task, they may find encouragement in the history of

one of the smallest denominations, but one whose history along the line of Christian unity has been consistent and persistent. Many hail with exaltation that "the centrifugal age of Christianity is closed. The centripetal action has begun" or "that the age of division is over; that of reunion is coming on," but the student of history will realize that there has been no centrifugal age for us—there has been no time when the spirit of division prevailed. From the beginning till now the voice of our denomination has been there must be no strife among us, for we be brethren in Christ. It hailed with exultant joy every struggle toward the realization of that unity for which Christ prayed. It would never admit, that what we have now in Christendom by way of united effort is all that should be expected. It scorns with righteous indignation that scoff that Christian unity is a iridescent dream. It was a Reformed theologian all aglow with the vision divine who imagined the Pope inviting "a fraternal Pan-Christian Council in Jerusalem, where the Mother Church of Christendom held the first council of reconciliation of peace. But," he adds, "whether in Jerusalem or Rome or (as Cardinal Wiseman thought) in Berlin, or (as some Americans think) on the banks of the Mississippi, the war between Rome, Wittenberg, Geneva and Oxford will be fought out to a peaceful end when all the churches shall be thoroughly Christianized and all the creeds of Christendom unified in the creed of Christ." Zwingli and Frederick the Third saw that day, and rejoiced to see it, and were glad. The Church which they inspired with the sense and value of Christian unity would as soon give up the hope of a millennium as the hope of a coming time when the watchman shall lift up the voice together, not only to say to the weary one: Thy God reigneth; but with the voice together shall they sing, for they shall see eye to eye when Jehovah is returning to Zion.

HAGERSTOWN, PA.

## IX.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### CHAOS OR COSMOS?

Russia is probably the the most wonderful country in the world, certainly the most wonderful country in Europe. For centuries there has been going on a process of consolidation and growth resulting in the establishment of the present empire which has hitherto been regarded as one of the great powers of the world, perhaps the most formidable, in the long run, of all the nations of Europe. This process, beginning, we may say, with Peter the Great, may be compared to the slow emergence of a continent out of the depths of the ocean and the gradual shaping of the land surface by geological upheavals and changes of level until a rich and fertile expanse of country is produced. The extension and growth of Russia have been, if comparatively slow, persistent and steady, resulting in accretions to the west, absorption of one country after another toward the east and southeast. A few years ago it seemed as though there were no power to check or roll back this onward movement any more than there is a power to check the progress of a glacier down the mountain side. It must be confessed, too, that administrative ability of a high order not only guided this progress, but also followed up every advantage gained so that the subdued countries, whether in the wilds of Siberia, the mountain regions of Armenia, or the plains of Kurdistan were joined as by indissoluble bonds to the central domain of the vast empire. It is well known how the advance of Russia in the way indicated inspired terror in the east, and made England tremble for the safety of her Indian empire in the south. Undoubtedly, this movement would long ere this have overwhelmed the prin-

icipalities of the Danube and swallowed up the Turkish empire, if the jealousy of the other powers of Europe had not sufficed to bring about a coalition and concert of action to prevent such a result.

The extension of the Russian empire and its growth in physical strength are not the only evidence which testifies to the virile power of the nation. In the field of art, in painting, in sculpture and in architecture she has been by no means barren. In literature names like Turgenieff and Tolstoi are household words, and in science her sons have had no mean place among the great men and leaders in the scientific progress of the day. We need only mention Struve in astronomy (although born in Germany) and Mendeléeff and Niewenglowski in chemistry. In fact, the universities, the laboratories, and the observatories of Russia have held high rank in the learned world.

It is not strange, therefore, that the eyes of the world have been upon Russia and that until the victorious career of the empire was checked by the little island kingdom of Japan, bringing about the present striking crisis in the affairs of the country, men wondered and perhaps feared what the result of a real awakening of the Russian people might mean. However, notwithstanding all that has been said, when we look beneath the surface and inquire into the actual condition of the people we find that the country has, on the whole, been asleep or walking as in a dream. In the first place, the absolute government, the exercise of entire control over every department of Russian life nominally by the Czar, but actually by the bureaucracy, is an anomaly in the age in which we live. It is possible only where the people are steeped in ignorance and superstition and have no consciousness either of their rights or their power. Russia is regarded as a civilized country. It may be freely granted that there are people of the highest culture and large attainments in art, science, and literature; but there is probably no country in Europe where

the mass of the population is as ignorant, besotted and superstitious as in this country. The poorer classes have no social development, no political rights, and no religious culture except such as is afforded by the ignorant and corrupt hierarchy of the Greek Church. The very fact that Russia has still been using the old style in its calendar, notwithstanding the astronomical knowledge of the present day, is evidence of the distance at which her people stand from the progressive life of our age.

The facts and conditions thus briefly described must be borne in mind if an adequate judgment is to be framed of the crisis in the present affairs of Russia before which the world stands aghast. No matter what the conditions may be in any country, the light of the modern age, its freedom and progress, is bound to penetrate into the darkest and densest mass. The desire for freedom pervades the educated people and it is gradually laying hold of the mass of the population. People who are on the verge of starvation, who are misgoverned and oppressed, plundered and punished without redress in the courts, even though ignorant and superstitious, seek for something better. But these strivings after freedom are met with repression, and thus there is a conflict between the absolute power of the autocracy and the sullen but determinate subjects throughout the empire. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be discontent and efforts at revolution, that there should be violent outbreaks among the people, revolt among the soldiers and sailors, and a condition of unrest and apprehension everywhere. The striving after freedom in individuals and communities can be guided and directed but not thwarted and repressed. And yet this is attempted, because the rulers fear the loss of absolute power; and, accordingly, there is a growing tension between rulers and subjects—a condition of society which forms a hot-bed for the growth of anarchy and nihilism.

Whilst it is true that the common people according to the

traditions of the past have had, and to some extent still have, implicit faith in "the little father," as they affectionately call the Czar (a faith that has been rudely shaken, however, by repeated acts of the emperor, such as the refusal to see the representatives of the people at Tsarkoe Selo and the dissolution of the Duma), in better informed circles the evils from which the people suffer have been attributed to the tyranny of the government. Thus a social philosophy has been nurtured which looks upon government itself as an evil. Anarchistic philosophers say that man is by nature good, gentle, kind and loving, and if he is only let alone, he will live in peace and enjoy prosperity. Therefore, government ought to be abolished and rulers, who are tyrants, ought to be put out of the way by assassination or by any other method possible. Out of this has grown the régime of the bullet and the dynamite bomb, the carnival of assassination so largely prevalent at the present time. When to this is joined the fanaticism of the Greek Church and the bigotry of race hatred as these come to view in the persecution and massacre of the Jews, the result is a social condition that beggars description.

As long as the government could depend upon the army and the navy it felt strong enough to repress every social movement toward reform and greater freedom. The disastrous failure in the conflict with Japan, however, brought on a crisis in the affairs of the country so far-reaching that the old order of things could no longer be maintained. The terrible outbreaks in different parts of the empire, the mutiny of the sailors at Sevastopol, and the growing reluctance of even the Cossacks to shoot and bayonet unarmed men and women, or to turn upon their comrades in arms, convinced the Czar at last that concessions must be made and reforms instituted if the integrity of the empire was to be maintained. He accordingly promulgated a program of reform, promising relief to the peasants, an improvement in the administration by the promulgation of a "fundamental law," and an approach to parlia-

mentary government in the constitution of a Duma or representative body to be convened in due course of time.

Much was hoped from the step thus taken in the direction of constitutional government. It promised the much-needed reforms, and held out to the people the prospect of a real participation in the government of the country by putting an end to arbitrary rule and linking the people and the rulers together by the bonds of a common and intelligent interest in the welfare of the country. Four things were especially demanded by the people, and it was expected that these would be speedily obtained under the new *régime*. These were: (1) Government by a responsible ministry. (2) The expropriation of land (either crown lands, or lands held by the church, or the nobility), for the use of the peasants, to be gradually paid for in course of time. (3) Amnesty to political prisoners. (4) The abolition of the death penalty. Over against these demands stood the reactionaries, the grand dukes, nobles of the royal family, and the highest dignitaries of the Greek Church. If the Czar had been a man of determination and force, or if he had been blessed with a leader who possessed his confidence and the confidence of the people, of sufficient strength to withstand the machinations of the beurocracy and magnetism enough to control the Duma, order might have come out of the confused movement and the hopes and wishes of the people, and probably of the Czar also, might have been realized. But M. Witte, the strongest man in sight, found himself unequal to the task, and the Czar vacillating and helpless, threw himself into the arms of the reactionaries by calling Goremykin to the premiership and causing a widening breach with the Duma through the acts of violence and repression which followed.

The Duma itself, as the first representative body, was by no means a model legislative assembly. It lacked harmony and cohesion, and whilst it had many men in it of great ability, it had no conspicuous leaders, strong enough to guide it to-

wards the desired goal. Mr. Petrunkévitch divides the members into the following parties: (1) The Moderates, led by Count Heyden and others, consisting of the conservative nobility, who, however, see the danger of impending revolution, and favor some kind of reform. (2) The Constitutional Democrats, representing the liberal nobility, who favor a constitutional monarchy and thorough-going reform. (3) The Social Democrats, representing the labor party. (4) The Social Revolutionists, ready to resort to violence to bring about a socialistic *régime*. Finally (5) the peasants themselves. If these parties had been consistently led by strong men with definite aims and purposes, it might have been possible to agree in the Duma upon a line of action which would have commanded the assent of the nation to an extent which would have compelled the acceptance of the proposed reforms by the Czar. But the Constitutional Democrats, instead of winning and crystallizing the moderate elements, strove to gain sufficient power by coquetting with the more radical forces, and thus opened the way for heated discussion and radical propositions which proved a means of information indeed to the country, but also a source of revolutionary sentiment leading to greater discontent and violent demonstrations among the masses. These were met in turn by the harsh repressive measures of Goremykin, so that the Duma demanded his dismissal as premier by the emperor. Thus the friction between the beaurocracy and the Duma grew from day to day, until the Czar dissolved the Duma and called for a new election. At the same time he dismissed Goremykin and appointed in his place M. Stolypin, whose program avowedly is "strong-handed reform," which means the maintenance of the power of the Czar, the repression of violence, and a policy of reform which includes the compulsory sale of the great landed estates and the sale of lands to the peasants on easy terms. The Constitutional Democrats will be satisfied with nothing less than a constitutional monarchy and a responsible

ministry, while the more radical elements seek by measures of violence the entire overthrow and abolition of the existing government. The whole country is, therefore, a seething caldron of discontent, strife, and violence, and it is absolutely impossible to tell what the outcome will be.

It is not likely that repression will gain its end. Revolutions never go backward. The chicken once hatched cannot be forced back into the egg. Monsters like Plehve and Trepoff may slay their thousands and, for a time, inspire awe by the horrors of which they are the authors, but they cannot pacify the country. The former was assassinated, the latter has just died a natural death; but if they succeed in protecting the life of their royal master, they only deepen the resentment of the people. Measures like the wholesale massacre at Siedlce, where, because a bomb was thrown by one person, the soldiers turned the machine guns upon the unoffending populace and massacred men, women, and children in cold blood, send a thrill of horror throughout the civilized world, alienate the sympathy of right-minded people, and swell the tide of popular wrath, until like the dammed up mountain stream, it carries everything before it. No, repression cannot save the country.

If repression cannot restore order and peace, then there are only two alternatives. Either there must be a gradual change under a strong leader—a change that will enlist popular sympathy and bring about the desired reforms in the church, in social relations, and in government; or else there will be a revolution which sweeps everything before it, drenches the nation in blood, wipes out the ruling dynasty, and resolves human society into a sort of primeval chaos which will swallow up the fruits of a thousand years' labor, and from which, perhaps, a new Russia will slowly and painfully emerge, as a new France emerged after the horrors of the French revolution. The difficulty which the first alternative has to encounter is that the social tension has by long repression become so great that the least yielding to pressure opens the way for movements

so strong as to overleap existing barriers, and thus by widening the breach threaten the safety of the whole. Besides, there is a mass of difficult material to deal with, as the South had to deal with the freed slaves during and after the period of reconstruction after our civil war. If Alexander II., when he gave the serfs their freedom, had given them land and education, and made them intelligent and self-respecting members of the empire, he would have conferred the greater boon upon his country. There is no antidote for social discontent and anarchism like the holding of land and prosperous industry. But that opportunity is gone. Is it too late?

The great lesson taught by poor, suffering Russia, an important lesson, taught most impressively, is the fundamental lesson of all ethical development in the individual or in the community, in Church or State, that while authority is important and development begins with obedience, *authority is in order to freedom, and, in the end, obedience must be intelligent and proceed from love.* It is a great thing for a ruler to have the affection and confidence of his people. But the people cannot remain children all their lives, and they need to have part in the administration of affairs; they must acquire an insight into the grounds of law, and an intelligent apprehension of the principles of government. To this end they need training, and as their intelligence grows, a larger measure of freedom. Neither Czar, nor Kaiser, nor Pontiff, can expect, in the long run, to exact obedience, unless room is made for freedom of thought and action in proportion to the degree of intellectual and moral development of their subjects. Perhaps the tendency of the modern age is to lay too little stress on authority. But authority can be maintained only where it stands upon a rational ground, and leads to an obedience that is intelligent and free.

JOHN S. STAHR.

## REFLECTIONS ON THE TRIAL OF DR. CRAPSEY.

The charges declare that Dr. Crapsey denies the following doctrines:

"1. The doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ is God, the Savior of the world, as contained and enunciated in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, and as set forth, indicated and declared in the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

"2. The doctrine that our Lord Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, as contained and enunciated, etc.

"3. The doctrine of the virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, as contained and enunciated, etc.

"4. The doctrine of the resurrection of our blessed Lord and Savior, as contained and enunciated, etc.

"5. The doctrine of the blessed Trinity, as contained and enunciated, etc."

According to the presentment he is in error in his teaching on the deity of Jesus, the miraculous conception, the virgin birth, the resurrection of Christ, and the Trinity. A more formidable series of errors touching the fundamentals of the Christian system could not well be set forth.

Dr. Crapsey, however, enters explicit denials of these charges and claims that while he does not hold the *littera scripta* of the creeds, he is true to the substance of the doctrines specified. (1) He professes to accept the doctrine of the incarnation, but holds that Joseph was the natural father of Christ. Here he clearly deviates from the accepted view of the church, but he regards himself within the scope of the liberty granted him by his church when he affirms the contrary view. (2) He professes to accept the doctrine of the Trinity, but as he understands it, a Sabellian conception which includes a trinity of character rather than of persons. We quote his own language in *The Churchman*: "I have merely preached the unfolding of the One in three, rather than the addition of two to that One in the composition of that Trinity." (3) On

the resurrection he says: "When I say that on the third day he rose again from the dead, I do not necessarily imply that the body in which he had lived was dematerialized, so that he assumed it and walked through doors. But I do believe that he rose again and revealed his spiritual body to the keen spiritual vision of his disciples, and I believe that in the strength of that resurrection they went forward to conquer the world."

In what respect does Dr. Crapsey differ from the teaching of his church or of the churches generally? He accepts the incarnation, but he does not consider the miraculous conception and the virgin birth as indispensable conditions for an incarnation. The church, however, at least since the third century, has related his conception and birth on the one hand and the incarnation on the other as cause and effect. Without the former the latter could not be possible. To deny the former is to renounce the latter. Dr. Crapsey agrees with his church on the *fact* of the incarnation but differs from it on the way in which the fact was realized. He evidently reaches the conviction that in Jesus dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily by another process than that followed by the churches in their symbols. He does not reject the doctrine of the Trinity, but differs from his church in his interpretation of it. Again, he holds the fact but becomes heretical when he explains it. He is very clear in the statement of his views on the resurrection. He denies a revival or a dematerialization of the corpse, but affirms the rising of a spiritual body in which Christ revealed himself to his disciples. His church, however, requires belief in a resurrection of the carnal body, of flesh and blood glorified or spiritualized. The difference seems to be rather on the method by which the fact was realized than on the fact itself. Dr. Crapsey may, therefore, with a conscience void of offense, say, "I believe in the incarnation, in the Trinity, and in the resurrection, but I ask the privilege of interpreting these facts in my own way."

It is not an easy matter to determine whether Dr. Crapsey is right or wrong. It is comparatively easy, however, to decide whether he agrees with or differs from the standards of the church. According to Judge Stiness the latter question was the only one at issue before the court of inquiry. The members of the court were not to decide whether the teaching of Dr. Crapsey was true or false, but whether it was what the church required him to teach. If that was the purpose of the trial, the verdict could only have been what it is, viz.: "That the respondent should be suspended from exercising the functions of the Church until such time as he shall satisfy the ecclesiastical authorities of the diocese that his belief and teaching conform to the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as this Church hath received the same." A minority report was filed by Dr. Dunham in which we find the following words: "From Dr. Crapsey's own statements and the evidence submitted for his defense, his error consists rather in presuming to define what God has not been pleased to reveal, and to interpret those doctrines in a manner not generally received by the Church, rather than in a denial and rejection of their truth and authority."

The question arises whether the church should be guided by the principle of Judge Stiness in its treatment of errorists or not. It is clear, indeed, as most Protestant churches are now constituted, that that is the only way by which heretics can be tried. The point at issue is not whether the doctrines of the accused person are right or wrong, but whether they conform to the symbols of the church. When one reflects for a moment upon this policy it becomes all the more startling. It makes short work of heresy, but it is in danger of shutting out at the same time the new light that breaks from the Word into the consciousness of the church. It presupposes the unchangeableness or infallibility of the church in its confessions. Finality has presumably been reached in the definition of doctrines. Argument and reason are superseded. Judg-

ment and condemnation alone are required. The test of the truth or falsehood of a doctrine is not the bible interpreted by the Christian reason and conscience, but a formula of a particular age which has been invested with infallible authority. It is, therefore, no longer necessary to test the doctrines by the scriptures and Christian experience and scholarship, which was one of the most precious privileges of original Protestantism. According to the church historian Socrates, this mode of procedure dates back to the year 383. The Emperor Theodosius, desiring to heal the schisms in the church, called a conference of the bishops, and conferred with Nectarius, the Bishop of Constantinople, to advise with him on the best method of procedure. The emperor thought that a fair discussion of the questions by all parties concerned was the best way for detecting error and removing the causes of trouble. But Nectarius, after counseling with his fellow bishops, recommended that it were better to fall back upon the testimony of the ancients instead of entering into logical debates. If the sects differ from the "ancients" let them be anathematized; if they agree with them let them be restored. Nectarius' advice has become the policy not only of Romanism but of Protestantism. The emperor's proposal of a fair discussion was forgotten, and has only been revived in the history of the church by the heretics when they plead for a hearing.

The presumptions are doubtless against Dr. Crapsey. He runs counter to the traditions of centuries held by most devout men of the church. His saying so does not make it so. He and all those who agree with him ought to reach their conclusions only after the most sincere and prayerful investigations. The church cannot permit such doctrines to be proclaimed with impunity. Built as it is upon a traditional system of orthodoxy, it would stultify itself and commit suicide, if it did not purge itself of the leaven of heterodoxy. It is the old conflict over again—representatives of two different view-

points and tendencies standing face to face, Theodosius and Nectarius, Luther and Leo X., free discussion and tradition, the religion of the spirit and the religions of authority.

We may see how close the attitude of the church toward Dr. Crapsey is to Romanism, when we consider Luther's trial at Worms. He was given the choice of recanting his errors or of excommunication. He outlined another method in his response to Dr. Eck, the prosecuting attorney: "Unless I am refuted or convicted by testimonies of the scriptures or by clear arguments (since I believe neither the Pope nor the councils alone; it being evident that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am conquered by the holy scriptures quoted by me, and my conscience is bound by the word of God; I cannot and will not recant anything, since it is unsafe and dangerous to do anything against the word of God." He asked for testimonies of scriptures, clear argument, and the right of conscience. But his requests were met with contempt and his conscience was to be silenced by anathemas.

We believe Protestantism has conserved the cardinal doctrines of Luther, but has it accepted his declaration at Worms? What would happen if some young Luther, whether right or wrong, should arise in a Lutheran, Reformed, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian judicatory and say: "Unless I am refuted and convicted by testimonies of the scriptures or by clear arguments (since I believe neither the catechism nor the creeds; it being evident that they have erred and contradicted themselves), I am conquered by the holy scriptures quoted by me, and my conscience is bound by the word of God, I cannot and will not recant anything, since it is unsafe and dangerous to do anything against the conscience." If such a one held doctrines so directly contrary to the churches named above as Luther's were to Rome, little regard, we fear, would be paid to scriptures, clear arguments, and his conscience. His deposition from office would be requested without further

proceedings and he would be coldly informed to find another church in which his teachings are accepted. Rome said so once to its best young men. They were cast off, and Rome has declined ever since.

It is not our purpose to compare Dr. Crapsey to Luther, but to show that the way in which both were tried and found guilty is essentially the same. It is not the Protestant but the Roman method of suppressing error. What then should the church do under such circumstances? Ought it not to protect itself against heresy? We answer unhesitatingly, yes. But it ought at the same time to preserve an open mind for truth from whatever source it may come. The doctrine of infallibility in all its forms is a great hindrance to the truth in Christ Jesus. The teachings of Dr. Crapsey are said to be shared by many of his fellow clergymen. Similar views are expressed by leading men in the churches of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany. Even the judicatory which tried him was divided, as appears in the minority report. The men holding these doctrines are reputed to be followers of Jesus, morally blameless, zealous in every good work, and devout scholars. Let it be granted that they are wrong in their theories, ought not the church to tolerate them until by conservative Christian scholarship they may be convinced that they are in error? Let them be met not by judicial action nor by appeals to infallible formulas, but by arguments from the scriptures, reason, and conscience. When a church can no longer tolerate a Briggs, a Smith, a McGiffert, a Gilbert, against not one of whom a charge of unchristian conduct has been brought, is it not time that the *church* pause to consider whether it does not need revision and reconstruction? After all, its dogmatic definitions may not be final. While the spiritual and moral influences which go forth from these heretics are confessedly Christ-like, it would not be jeopardizing the kingdom of God on earth if the Christian churches in all lands would enjoin liberals and conservatives

to unite in fraternal conferences, arguments, and discussions to seek the truth in love. There was a time when right living was the test of discipleship (Matt. 7:20). Now conduct is secondary, and all stress is laid on right thinking. For a man to claim perfect morality would be fanaticism, but for him to deny that he is perfect in his thinking, orthodox, is heresy.

We do not contend that Dr. Crapsey is either right or wrong. That question ought not to be hastily decided in the light of present-day scholarship. To declare him right by a wave of the hand is as dangerous as to declare him wrong by a judicial action. But we claim that the church ought so to change its constitution that men of unquestioned Christian character, who differ from it in the interpretation of its doctrinal standards, could be consistently continued in its service. An ecclesiastical court is not in a position to determine the truth or error of the doctrines which were at issue in Dr. Crapsey's trial. These are questions which can only be settled by expert Christian scholarship and by the normal Christian consciousness. In the meantime let the errors be considered as tares sown in the field. Let them grow until the harvest comes and God separates the wheat from the tares. Let the church practice the tolerance of Jesus to whom the disciples complained of teachers who were not working with them. John said: "We saw one casting out devils in thy name and we forbade him because he followeth not us." But Jesus said: "Forbid him not: for he that is not against you is for you." The standard by which the Master tried men and their doctrines was the power to cast out devils. While they are doing the *work* of Jesus they will in due time come into closer agreement in their *thinking* about Jesus.

When shall we think aright on the nature of the Godhead, the person of Jesus, and the significance of the particular acts of his life? When we shall be like him, we shall see him as he is (I. John 3:2). Our knowledge of him is commensurate

with our spiritual likeness to him. It is a serious inversion of the scriptural theory of knowledge when we demand of the Christian or the Christian officer a final and infallible knowledge of the being of the Godhead, and at the same time acknowledge him to be a mere babe in Christ in spiritual attainments. How can a man, who confesses every Sunday that he has "grievously sinned against Thee, in thought, word and in deed," profess to have absolute and final knowledge of the things of God such as is implied in the charges against Dr. Crapsey? Moral imperfection and intellectual perfection in an individual are not in harmony with the teachings of the New Testament nor with the laws of the human mind. You may believe in Greek Fathers and in ecumenical councils, and accept their interpretation of Christianity as final, but the Reformers taught that popes and councils have erred and Protestants are not bound by their decisions. Faith in Jesus as he is set forth in the scriptures is an altogether different thing from faith in Jesus as defined in the Nicene Creed. Faith in the Father who abides in Jesus is different from faith in a theory of conception and birth; faith in the risen and ever-present Lord is different from faith in a mode of the resurrection of the body. The one kind of faith is begotten by the spirit of Jesus through his word in the heart of babes. The other kind of faith is demanded by Christian theologians, whether it be the result of personal conviction or not. In eternity, ages hence, we expect Christians to become orthodox; but now we know in part and we prophesy in part: when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. In the meantime we count not ourselves to have apprehended, but one thing we do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, we press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. We shall continue to trust Jesus, to hope in Jesus, and to love Jesus. Thus while we are on the way with him, mysteries may be solved, the infinite

and eternal nature of God may become as transparent to us as to the Fathers, and we shall accept their definitions not only because they are a sacred tradition, but because they have been verified by our reason and conscience. Then, indeed, they have become spirit and life in us and "we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves." The church, accordingly, should be the organization in which men, with mutual confidence in one another, are free to seek truth and righteousness. They only are to be excluded from its fellowship who hold down the truth in unrighteousness. They are the leaven of malice and wickedness which contaminates the members. But the man whose honesty of inquiry is proven by the purity of his life and the loyalty of his devotion to Jesus may safely be kept in the church without weakening its inner life or its influence in the world.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

## X.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**EXPOSITIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.** By the Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Litt.D. A Complete Commentary on the Bible in Thirty Volumes, to be published in Annual Series of Six Volumes. First Series, Six Volumes, Comprising: The Book of Genesis, The Prophecies of Isaiah (Chapters 49-66), The Prophecies of Jeremiah, The Gospel of St. Matthew (three volumes). New York, 3 and 5 W. 18th St., A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price per set of six volumes, \$7.50 net.

A commentary on the Bible, to be completed in thirty volumes by one man, seems an almost presumptuous undertaking. Few men could venture on the performance of such a task and still maintain the respect of preachers and scholars. Dr. Maclaren, however, in his ministry of more than fifty years has so won, by his expository discourses and writings, the attention of the Christian world that the publication of his expositions covering the whole Bible will be cordially welcomed. Marcus Dods says of him: "He is one of those exceptional men who can afford to print all they utter." For years he has been generally recognized as the prince of expositors. The material for these volumes has not been prepared in a short time at a publisher's order; it is the fruit of his life-long labors. He has put at the disposal of the editor, the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, editor of "The Expositor's Bible," the whole series of manuscripts prepared by him for the pulpit during his ministry. In addition, many hundreds of expositions published in periodicals and not reprinted have been drawn upon; but the greater part appears for the first time in book form, and every page has been submitted to the careful revision of Dr. Maclaren, which in many cases amounted to virtual rewriting.

The plan of presenting the material is the same in each volume. The table of contents for the book of Genesis contains the topics of fifty-one expositions, each averaging about five pages. Only a few chapters are omitted, while on the more important chapters several expositions are given. The topic is always incisively and suggestively stated, as for example, The Vision of Creation (Gen. I: 26-II: 3), How Sin Came In (Gen. III: 1-15), What Crouches at the Door (Gen. IV: 7, Rev. V.), etc. The verses, which are explained, are printed at the beginning of each section. The heads or divisions, under which the discussion is conducted, are clearly stated and expounded in order. This is the mode of procedure in all the volumes of the series.

The method is different from that of the Expositor's Bible, or the Preacher's Bible, or any homiletical commentary we have yet examined. The work bears evidence of exhaustive exegesis, of painstaking care to cast the biblical meaning into a new and original mold of expression, and of a masterly application of scriptural principles to the conditions of modern life. On every page one finds the word of God with the stamp of the personality of the great preacher, teacher, and scholar upon it. His literary style is rarely equalled in works of this kind. It is enlivened by imagination, keen and captivating in its epigrams and antitheses, warm and inspiring in its fervor and force. Some one has said: "He has the eye of a hawk and the heart of a saint."

The mechanical structure of the volumes is most commendable. The binding is red buckram cloth, the printing is in special type of unique and beautiful face, and the paper is specially imported English feather-weight. The volumes will not be sold separately but in series of six at the price stated above.

We are slow to recommend books of the homiletic kind to the ministry. We have not received much benefit from them and believe that they too often are turned into a crutch rather than into a guide. Yet the use we have made of these volumes in the preparation of Sunday-school lessons and sermons has convinced us that they can be made a valuable aid to the preacher and the teacher. They will be read with a great deal of satisfaction by laymen who seek sound, practical, and inspiring expositions of the books of the Scriptures. The fact that they follow chapter after chapter, almost verse after verse, gives the work a certain unity which makes it especially desirable for consecutive reading. The work is suitable, therefore, for the pastor's study, the Sunday-school and public library, and the library in the home.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THOMAS CRANMER AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Albert Frederick Pollard, M.A., Professor of Constitutional History, University College, London. Pages xv + 399. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price \$1.35 net.

Cranmer has been called the most mysterious figure of the English Reformation. He was born of humble parentage; he died having been "the first Protestant archbishop of the kingdom, and the greatest instrument, under God, of the happy Reformation of this Church of England." He lived in troublous times and the ambiguities which obscured his career arose not from the complexity of his mind but from the contrasts and contradictions of the age in which he lived. He was scholarly, courteous, peace-loving, patriotic, and conscientious. His friends

spoke of his "incredible sweetness of manners"; his enemies commended his courtesy. His forgiving disposition became a proverb. "Do my Lord of Canterbury a shrewd (*i. e.*, an evil) turn," writes Shakespeare, "and he is your friend for ever." Probably he was the only man who could command Henry VIII.'s absolute confidence because of the contrast in their characters. His sensitive disposition and his earnest desire to do that which was beneficial to the realm doubtless betrayed him into a series of recantations at the close of his life, which he so heroically retracted in the hour of his death.

History has passed diverse judgments on the great Archbishop. He has been roundly abused and vigorously defended. The author of this volume endeavors to present a calm and yet favorable account of the Reformer. He does not try to excuse him for his faults but to explain them in the light of the circumstances of the age. The political and religious atmosphere are supposed to account for many of the apparently irreconcilable acts of the man. "A failure to realize this unfamiliar atmosphere vitiates most of the estimates of Cranmer's career and character, and notably those of the Whig school represented by Hallam and Macaulay."

When one reads the graphic account of Cranmer's part in the reform movements under King Henry VIII., his progressive conservatism under Edward VI., his patient perseverance under the Catholic reaction of Mary, the conviction grows on the reader that England was in need of such a man at that time. Yet there were so many currents and counter currents in Church and State that both from a partisan view-point of the sixteenth century and from a present-day standpoint, he may be severely condemned. We must remember, however, that he was himself a seeker after truth. The full-grown Protestantism which we now enjoy was then only in the process of development. Its leaders naturally faltered at times in proportion as they were sincere and scrupulous. "The fact that Cranmer's work has stood the test of time almost unchanged is astonishing evidence of the fidelity with which he reflected the deepest feelings of the English people." The greatest work of his genius is the Prayer Book which is repeated by millions of men and women to this day.

The author has succeeded admirably in weaving the facts and events of the English Reformation to the time of Mary around its central figure. The political, religious, and moral questions which were involved in the movement are clearly presented. The relation between English and Continental reformers is, also, set forth. There were continuous correspondence and close fellowship between Protestant leaders in western Europe. They coun-

elled with one another and were then still willing to learn from one another. Cranmer's superior scholarship, his changes of view on the sacraments, his preparation of the Prayer Book, his last days and martyrdom are described with the precision, critical acumen, and vivacity of one who is master of his subject.

The volume is one of the series of the *Heroes of the Reformation*. It contains twenty-one illustrations of the leading characters of the period and a copious index. It will serve as an excellent introduction to the study of the English Reformation, and will help the ripe scholar to a better understanding of the various factors which entered into the making of a great personality and reformer.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

**JESUS AND THE PROPHETS.** An Historical, Exegetical and Interpretative Discussion of the Use of Old Testament Prophecy by Jesus and of His Attitude towards it. By Charles S. Macfarland, Ph.D. (Yale), Minister of the Maplewood Congregational Church of Walden, Massachusetts. With an Introduction by Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D., D.D., Dean of the Divinity School of Yale University. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price \$1.50 net.

The use which Jesus made of Old Testament prophecy and His attitude towards it, are no doubt among the important problems confronting the student of the New Testament. In the Old Testament God spake "in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners"; in the New Testament God speaks to us "in his Son," who is "the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance." It is the same God who speaks to us in both revelations: but in the one case the revelation is in part, suited to particular needs and circumstances; in the other it is given in absolute, universal and final form, suited to all times and applicable to all conditions and circumstances. Jesus himself acknowledged the validity and value of the Old Testament. He not only expounded its teaching, but quoted it as authoritative, and based his teaching upon it.

Now, the important question for the New Testament student is, How did Jesus conceive the authority of the prophets? This is the problem with which the book before us deals. The author states the problem thus: "There are two ways of looking at prophecy. One is to consider it as, primarily, prediction, and secondarily, preaching. Another way is to reverse this order. The conception of prophecy itself will determine the idea of its fulfilment. If prophecy is primarily the forecasting of special concrete events then its fulfilment is something literal and detailed. If, on the other hand, prophecy is primarily truth, then its fulfilment will mean something more than that of the letter.

"Which of these ways did Jesus regard as of supreme importance? Was he concerned with prophecy as prediction? Or was he concerned with prophecy as truth? Did he, first of all, conceive of the prophetic mission as the revelation of the thoughts and will of God: or was his first interest in it a detailed prognostication of things which had relative moral insignificance? With regard to Messianic prophecy: Was this to him the forecasting of Israel's future as an ideal for the race, which ideal was realized in the Gospel? Or was he concerned with Messianic prophecy as a series of definite descriptions with which he was to correspond in his earthly life?"

Our author rightly assumes that Jesus looked upon the prophecies of the Old Testament, not primarily as prediction, but as the revelation of the thoughts and will of God. He sets this threefold task for himself: (1) "To set forth Jesus' use of prophecy; (2) To indicate his attitude towards it and the standard by which he valued it; (3) In the light of this, to show what its fulfilment signified with him, and how he regarded himself as the 'fulfiller' of prophecy." And in the accomplishment of this task, the author takes up for detailed study the several quotations which Jesus is reported to have made from the prophets. He discusses first the seven quotations found in all the synoptists; then he takes up two found in Matthew and Mark; then one found in Mark alone; then those which are common to Matthew and Luke; then those found only in Matthew, in Luke, and in John. This detailed discussion is followed by a study of Jesus' use of prophetic phrases, terms, figures and language, and of some of his allusions to the prophets and to prophecy.

We endorse the following estimate of the book, given in the introduction by Professor Sanders: "There is a real reward in store for him who patiently studies the methods of Jesus in interpretation as revealed in his use of the Old Testament. This volume skilfully exhibits these methods without sacrificing, as so many of its predecessors have done, the religious value of the implied judgments. It brings before us on a basis of exact and adequate scholarship the secret of the vigorous spirituality and the unfailing enthusiasm of the Jesus of history. It will send the student with fresh eagerness to the prophetic writings which the Lord considered as an indispensable factor in his own religious growth, whose testimony to himself he accepted as direct and adequate."

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PENTATEUCH. By Randolph H. McKim, D.D., L.L.D. New York, Longmans, Green and Co. Price \$1.00.

A book of 136 pages, well printed, with full table of contents, and a "Fore-word" by Dean Henry Mace, D.D., to whom the book is dedicated. The book consists of three lectures delivered at the Virginia Theological Seminary, with a copious introduction. It is an examination of the results of higher criticism, and is especially directed against the Welhausen theory, as represented by Welhausen and his disciples.

The author lays a good foundation by making his appeal "to the forum of opinion over which common sense presides." In doing this he reminds the reader that both Welhausen and Robertson Smith laid their cause before the same court, and declared their argument "to be within the scope of any one who reads the English Bible carefully, and is able to think clearly."

He disclaims at the outset to be an orientalist, a Hebraist, an archaeologist, or an expert in literary analysis. This, however, is no bar to his sitting in judgment, as one of the jury, upon the arguments of the expert, which he does to the satisfaction of the reader. He never trips himself by the use of fact or argument beyond the limits which he has set himself. While the book calls for careful reading, one who is willing to think and examine is able to follow his argument intelligently, and such readers must be impressed by the candor, fairness and ability with which it is presented.

The disagreement of the critics, the uncertain ground we should have to stand upon if left only to their guidance, and the intolerant spirit of negative critics are presented with great force. In answer to the cry of "traditionalism," and dependence upon authority, he shows that the unlearned reader who accepts the claims of the critics is dependent upon their authority; an authority which is marked by disagreement, and by positive and confident assertions which have been disproved. Examples of such assertion which later discovery has shown to be false are given. He presents the real issue to be, not, how do the Old Testament writings come to us, nor, have they been compiled at a later age than when first given, but, are they trustworthy?

The author has nothing to say against free investigation of the Bible. He rather welcomes such investigation. He claims, however, that the believing critic ought not to lay aside his prepossession in favor of the Bible, nor the favorable attitude of his mind towards it. Such an attitude is no bar to free investigation but may guard him against admitting on sight statements against its trustworthiness, and the claims of negative critics. The author is undoubtedly right. We have long felt that a

mistaken frankness may concede more than is fair, as readily as a stubborn prejudice may withhold what is fair. When men say, let us approach the examination of the Bible with no bias for or against it, let us lay aside all our prepossession in its favor, it sounds much as if we were asked to pass judgment upon our mother, with forgetfulness of what we owe to her love and care.

The author of this book is Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., and President of the Lower House of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We commend it to the readers of the REVIEW, and are sure that they will be charmed with the courteous, Christian spirit pervading the book, as well as with the ability of the writer.

ELLIS N. KREMER.

ORIENTALISCHE STUDIEN. Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag (2. März, 1906) gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern und in ihrem Auftrag herausgegeben von Carl Bezold. Mit dem Bildnis Th. Nöldeke's, einer Tafel und Zwölf Abbildungen. Zwei Bände. LIV u. 1187 Seiten. Geheftet 40 Mk., in Leder gebunden 46 Mk. Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann (Vormals J. Ricker). Gießen, 1906.

On the second of March Professor Theodor Nöldeke, in Strassburg, Alsace-Lorraine, one of the greatest orientalists of the age, whose name is mentioned with equal reverence on both hemispheres, and who is still in bodily and mental vigor, celebrated his seventieth birthday. This was the occasion of the publication of this work.

Nöldeke was born on the second of March, 1836, in Harburg, Hannover, studied oriental languages in Göttingen (under Ewald and Benfey), also in Vienna, Leiden, and Berlin. In 1861 he acquired the right of holding academical lectures in the University of Göttingen. In 1864 he was appointed professor extraordinarius there, and in 1868 professor ordinarius in Kiel. Since 1872 he is in connection with the University of Strassburg as professor of Semitic philology. His first publication, which appeared first in Latin and then a year later in German, in 1860, under the title, "Die Geschichte des Qorâns," won for him the prize of the Academy of Sciences at Paris over his competitors Muir, an Englishman, and Sprenger, an Austrian, who wrote on the same subject. From this moment Nöldeke belongs to the most productive and authoritative orientalists.

Nöldeke's prolific literary activity extends over widely different departments of Semitic philology and history and often passes beyond into the Indogermanic field (Iranian). His works on Arabic poetry and Semitic grammar (*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der alten Araber, Urwa, Delectus, Muallakat*, etc.; *Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch, Beiträge zur semitischen*

*Sprachwissenschaft*, etc.) are as valuable as his contributions to Old Testament science (*Die alttestamentliche Litteratur, Untersuchungen zur Kritik des alten Testaments*, etc.) and as his studies in Persian history and on the *Shahnamah* ("Book of Kings") of Firdousi, the national epic of the Persians. Nöldeke devoted himself, however, more especially to the study of the Aramaic languages, and his grammars of the Syriac, Neo-Syriac, and Mandaic are the best works that have appeared on these languages.

Nöldeke is not only a prolific author, an accurate philologist, and thorough linguist, but equally as prominent and as great, if not greater, as a keen critic and an acute historian. His "*Geschichte der Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden*" (1879) is a standard and classical work.

Nöldeke reads everything that appears in his department or related departments of knowledge, and criticizes it either publicly or through an extensive correspondence. Though Nöldeke in his modesty constantly disclaims the right to speak with authority on matters pertaining to the young science of Assyriology, nevertheless, Assyriologists consider themselves fortunate when they can receive his judgment on some moot point in their science.

The writer of these lines first became acquainted with Nöldeke through his "*Semitic Languages*"; he was directed by his teacher, Dr. Gast, to this classic as the best brief, yet comprehensive survey of the Semitic languages that has ever appeared. Some years later it was the writer's privilege as a student of Nöldeke's, in the University of Strassburg, to meet with this man and scholar almost daily for a number of semesters in his study along the charming and picturesque Ill.

"*Orientalische Studien*" is a significant and an abiding memorial erected by friends and students who in their intimate intercourse with Theodor Nöldeke learned to admire his comprehensive and exact detailed scholarship, as well as his earnest, yet jovial personality.

A glance at the list of contributors to this work shows the international character of Nöldeke's students. The following countries are represented in this list: Germany, Russia, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Italy, France, England, Holland, Sweden, Finland, Portugal, Algeria, Syria, and the United States of America. In addition the inhabitants of the isles afar off (Java) have likewise on this occasion arisen to do honor to this great scholar. Most of the positions in Semitic philology in German-speaking countries, if not also in English-speaking countries, are held by men who were at one time or other students of Nöldeke.

The work is prefaced by the great Dutch Arabist, M. J. De Goeje, who also contributes the interesting opening essay on the call of Mohammed. In addressing Nöldeke in the preface to the work De Goeje says:

"Auf dem grossen Gebiete der Semitischen Philologie im weitesten Sinne, von welchem die meisten von uns nur einen Bruchteil beherrschen, sind Sie unumschränkter Meister; ja, Sie haben die Grenzen dieses Wissensreichs nach verschiedenen Seiten weit überschritten."

The subjects discussed in this work by the eighty-six contributors, who were selected from the large circle of Nöldeke's students and friends, are not only taken from the extensive field of Semitic research, but also from the field of Oriental research outside the Semitic, and may be taken to indicate, in a measure, the extensiveness of the field of knowledge mastered by Nöldeke. The Hebraist, the Arabist, the Syriologist, the Assyriologist, the student of Ethiopic, the Egyptologist, the student of the Iranian and Turkish languages and literatures, the classical philologist, the student of the Old Testament, the student of early church history, the student of Islam—all these, as well as others, will find discussed in this work subjects pertaining to their particular department of knowledge. I have used the volumes for about four weeks, and have learned much from them so far. They are a veritable mine of oriental lore.

The work also contains a list of the writings of Nöldeke, compiled by Ernst Kuhn. This list fills thirty-eight pages, and from it even the layman may form a somewhat adequate idea of the great fertility and the remarkable versatility of the famous scholar.

The valuable indices of the work were prepared by C. Bezold. The printing was done by W. Drugulin in Leipzig, the mere statement of which is a sufficient guaranty that it is neatly and well done. From the bookbinder's standpoint the work is also a thing of beauty.

At the conclusion of this notice the fact may be mentioned, that at the close of the winter semester Nöldeke retired from his professorship in the University of Strassburg, and was succeeded by a former student of his, Enno Littmann, who was at the time holding a position in Princeton University.

U. of C., May 25, 1906.

IRWIN HOCH DE LONG.

THE CRITICISM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, Eight lectures on the Morse Foundation, delivered in Union Seminary, N. Y., in October and November, 1904. By William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, Publishers, pp. 286.

Among the "open questions" of New Testament criticism, the Johannine problem is at present most vital and important.

This volume of Dr. Sanday is one of the recent significant contributions to the subject from the conservative point of view. The first chapter is a suggestive "survey of the recent literature" on the subject and in itself is an illumination of the problem. The "conservative" point of view is best represented by Zahn, B. Weiss, Beyschlag, Luthardt, Godet, Wescott, and Drummond; the "mediating," by Harnack, Shürer, Delff, and Dobschütz; the "partition," by Wendt and Briggs; the view of "uncompromising rejection," by Jülicher, Holtzmann, Schmiedel, Wrede, Wernle, Reville, and Loisy.

Of the two hundred and sixty-eight pages Dr. Sanday gives but fourteen to the consideration of the external evidence for the integrity and authenticity of the Gospel in question. In this respect his treatment is conspicuously unsatisfactory. He practically surrenders the Gospel on the external evidence but emphatically claims it on the ground of the internal. Indeed, he seems so certain of his case after giving the latter evidence, as to make it seem a matter of course that, despite the weakness of the former, the full authenticity of the Gospel be acknowledged. Those interested in this important New Testament problem should read Dr. Drummond's "Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," for the reason that he makes most of the external evidence. Together, Drs. Sanday and Drummond, present the conservative point of view better than any single one of our English defenders.

It is characteristic of Dr. Sanday's treatment that he returns to the outlines of the oldest solution of the problem, as given by Eusebius, who summarizes the "Hypotyposes" of Clement of Alexandria: (1) "The Gospel is the work of St. John the Apostle—for there is no doubt that he is intended. (2) It was written towards the end of his life, after the publication of the other three. (3) The three Gospels were in the hand of the Apostle, and he had read and up to a certain point approved of them. (4) What he himself undertook to write was a spiritual Gospel, not a biography; the difference is important. (5) In contrast with the other Gospels it was recognized as being in a special sense a spiritual Gospel." This method of approach is along the lines of the internal evidence and the opposite of that of most critical scholars on the Continent who emphasize the external evidence and on the basis of which, largely on the "argument of silence," declare against the authenticity of the Gospel.

The detailed development of the internal evidence in chapters IV.-V. inclusive is full of interest and suggestion. We know no stronger presentation of the case. It centers around the claim that the Gospel is by an eye-witness. The "pragmatism" of the

Gospel, in touching on the pilgrimages, Jewish ceremonies, the Temple, sects and parties, Jewish ideas and dialectics, and the Messianic hope, clearly shows the intimate knowledge of a Jew and an eye-witness. This phase of the internal evidence outweighs the difficulties of the differences of this Gospel and the synoptists in placing the main scenes of the work of Jesus, the duration of the ministry, the placing of the cleansing of the Temple, the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, the date of the Lord's supper and the crucifixion. These difficulties are fairly presented and met. In like manner the charge that the Gospel lacks development in the narrative is accounted for in a very suggestive way by emphasizing the fact that the purpose of the writer is not a biography but a spiritual Gospel.

For a fine outline-view of the doctrine of the Logos and its influence upon the Gospel chapter VI. is very good. Here, as in the elaborate treatment of the internal evidence throughout, Dr. Sanday is strong in his emphasis of the historical element in the Johannine idea of the Logos. The Gospel ever centers in the experimental and historical. The content of the Logos doctrine finds its beginnings in the Old Testament rather than in Philo and its fulness in the historic Jesus, no matter if the formal expression may have been taken from current Alexandrian ideas. This leads into the discussion of the Christology of the Gospel in chapter VII. During these days it is necessary to get clear views of tendencies. With reference to the tendency which emphasizes the development of the New Testament literature and theology, and overestimates the synoptic gospels as purely historical and the genius of Paul in adding to the simple Gospel of Jesus, and makes the Johannine Christology, the cap-stone of the adding process, Dr. Sanday may be said to state it fairly and meet it squarely, especially in the claim that the confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, was the common ground and experience of all Christians. It grew out of the unity of the consciousness of the first Christian community. This may well be emphasized with good results in these days when we are prone to differentiate the several points of view as Petrine, Pauline, Johannine, etc., and accentuate the differences, forgetting the real unities which underlie them and show them to spring naturally out of the consciousness of the first Christian community.

The treatment of the external evidence is altogether too brief and unsatisfactory. The unsolved problems are barely suggested. One wishes for the vigorous handling of Drummond or Zahn to make a conservative statement of the case complete.

EDWARD L. BROMER.

**THE ORIGIN AND PERMANENT VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. Pages 270. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

This is a readable volume giving in popular form the results of the constructive higher criticism.

In the opening chapter the author shows that until two centuries after the Reformation the Old Testament was valued as highly by the Church as the New, but that it lost this position through the reaction caused by its misinterpretation on the part of the Puritans, through the suspicion awakened by the first results of higher criticism, and the difficulty of understanding it. It is, however, rapidly regaining its former position. Through the testimony of the monuments, the study of languages, geography, history and by allowing the Old Testament to speak for itself it has been cleared of rabbinical and Middle Age traditions and become a new book.

In discussing the nature of the Old Testament the author says that at the foundation of it is a vital union between Jehovah and his people. Through them he reveals his character and will in the terms of life. Of this the Old Testament is a record. We know that it is inspired because it inspires. The spirit of the Almighty touched the spirit of certain men in ancient Israel so that they became prophets and seers, their vision being clarified so that they were able to discern God's revelation of himself. The purpose which these writers had in mind in committing to writing the revelations which they had received was the ethical and religious development of the people. The revelation of God recorded in the Old Testament was not confined to the Israelites, but to the whole human race. Man has probably been in existence a hundred thousand years. God did not leave him without a revelation of himself, but in discerning this revelation mankind saw through a "glass darkly." The Hebrews for various reasons were chosen as the nation through whom God would give a revelation of himself to mankind. They through their inspired prophets sifted from the revelation God had made to earlier nations, especially the Babylonians, what was true and enlarged upon it for the perfection of which Christ came.

The body of the book is devoted to an account of the origin of the several kinds of literature found in the Old Testament.

The origin of the prophetic histories is first explained. The period covered by them is from the creation through Samuel. The material incorporated into these histories is derived from certain early literature, such as "The Book of the Upright," "The Book of the Wars of Jehovah," and "The Blessings of Jacob," and from numerous oral traditions of heroes and events,

some of which came from the Babylonians. About the end of the ninth century B. C. a Judean prophet or school of prophets wrote the first history drawn from these various sources and covering the period from the creation through Samuel. About the middle of the eighth century a Northern prophet wrote the same kind of history from his point of view, extending from Abraham to Samuel. Later a history covering the period from the sojourn in the wilderness to the conquest of East Jordan appeared. Some time after 722 B. C. a prophet or school of prophets combined these two histories, supplementing what they contained. They were combined just as in New Testament times Tatian combined the Gospels in his diatessaron. In the case of the New Testament the combination passed out of use and the separate Gospels took its place. In the Old Testament the combined history survived and the separate histories were lost. The third narrative mentioned above was incorporated later and the history carried on to the Babylonian captivity in Kings. The purpose of these histories was to teach religious truth and eliminate the immoral from the oral traditions.

The origin of the prophetic sermons, epistles and apocalypses is next explained. The prophets knew the needs of their times. They knew the will of God and were his spokesmen. Sometimes they wrote their addresses. In other cases they were written down by their hearers. These prophetic books bear the marks of editors' work. Sometimes, as in the latter half of Isaiah, these additions have a distinct value of their own. Frequently they are the adaptation of the teachings of the prophets to later times. The period covered by the writings of the prophets is from 750 B. C. to 165 B. C., Daniel's prophecy being assigned to this latter period. These are the oldest writings of the Old Testament and correspond to the epistles of the New.

The following chapters give an account of the origin of the earlier Old Testament laws and the priestly laws. The prophet was before the law-giver. The prophet enunciated the principle which was later worked out into laws. God put his principles into the growing ethical consciousness of his people and they elaborated them into laws. Moses as a prophet gave principles, as a judge rendered decisions, that is, made laws, and as an organizer put them into the institutions which he formed. This was the nucleus of the whole legal system which came later. The laws were first handed down orally. The primitive code grew up from 1200 to 800 B. C. In their nature they were ceremonial, civil and humane.

From 800 to 600 B. C., through the prophets Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah, new principles were enunciated which gave rise to new laws of a more spiritual and ethical character. They incor-

porated what was best in the primitive code. They are found in Deuteronomy.

The priestly laws sprang up during the exile from 600 to 400 B. C. They are found in Exodus and Leviticus. There were also priestly historians whose narratives serve as introductions to their laws and are found in the Pentateuch, where they, with the laws, were placed after 400 B. C. About 250 B. C. a priest wrote I. and II. Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah. Their history is inferior to the prophetic narratives.

In the same natural way is explained the growth of the wisdom literature, the philosophical writings and the Psalter. The Proverbs are the sayings of the sages. They were the embodiment of experimental wisdom. They were collected from many ages. Solomon may be the author of a few. The oldest collection (chapters 10 to 22) bears the marks of the age of the pre-exilic prophets. The psalms spring from perhaps a hundred different authors. The oldest collection (3 to 41 and 51 to 72) was gathered not later than 400 B. C. The psalms have the marks of pre-exilic times and of later times to 165 B. C. David may have written some.

The canonization of the Hexateuch took place about 350 B. C. and that of the prophets about 200 B. C. The canonization of the sacred writings was not completed until 100 A. D.

The concluding chapters deal with the interpretation of the early narratives and practical methods of studying the Old Testament. The last chapter is a strong plea for better religious education which the author regards as the fundamental problem of the day.

As is well known, there is a large class of Christian scholars who dissent from the general position of the author. But whether a person occupies his position or not, one will be greatly benefitted by the study of this volume. The best that we can do is to acquaint ourselves with the literature on both sides of the question if we wish to come to an intelligent conclusion. The author shows in this volume that the Old Testament came into existence much as the New. This is one of the strong points in the book and will go far to commend his views to students. The writer declares that if Ingersoll had been educated to look upon the Pentateuch as a composite work his lecture on "The Mistakes of Moses" would have been impossible. W. D. HAPPEL.

**THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.** By George Barker Stevens, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Pages xii + 546. The International Theological Library. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. Price \$2.50.

This volume is reviewed at length in article VI. of the present issue.

n  
o  
e  
o  
e  
t  
.